

SOME BRIEF
OBSERVATIONS
AND
REFLECTIONS
ON

Mr. *Whiston's* late Writings,

Falsly Entic'd

Primitive Christianity Reviv'd:

SHEWING,

The Unreasonableness, Partiality, and Inconsistency, of his whole Performance; and that it no ways answers his Audacious Design of disproving the True and Proper Divinity of our Blessed Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*.

By JOHN EDWARDS, D.D.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. Lawrence, in the Paultry; and
J. Wyat, and R. Robinson, in St. Paul's Church-
Yard, M DCC XII.

SOME BRIEF
OBSERVATIONS
AND
REFLECTIONS
ON

Mr. Wilson's late Writings

Fally Entitled

Primitive Christianity Restored

THE WING

The Unfavourable, Partially and Incom-
plete, of his whole Performance; and that
it no ways answers his Ambitious Design of
disproving the Ten and Error Division of the
Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

By John Edwards, D.D.

LONDON:

Printed for J. Lintock, in the Strand; and
J. Wain, and R. Knapton, in St. Paul's Church-
yard, MDCCLXII.

The PREFACE

ii

mony in this place asserts the Deity of Christ.

~~It is not possible for the~~

~~ology had its denomination from it. It is not possible~~

~~then to see, that a professed Divine should exclude this~~

~~Grand Point of our Christianity; and that any Christian~~

~~should be employed to preach and teach~~

~~this (and other Sound Doctrines of Christianity) out of the~~

~~World, should be to the down of the~~

~~ing the point of the Christian religion.~~

~~and either take no notice of these plain Texts of Scripture~~

~~which have been already and urged for the history~~

~~of the Sacred Doctrine of the Trinity, and thereby but to~~

~~give some other answer, and thereby but to show in~~

~~out of respect to the~~

~~ly) in fact to show a design to give the~~

~~Society, and thereby but to show in~~

~~I will beg leave of the Reader, to bring in~~

~~such one very remarkable passage of this in the last~~

~~Am very sensible how great mischief is threatened~~

~~to our Holy Religion by Mr. Whiston's late Wri-~~

~~tings, wherein he endeavours to shake, and even to~~

~~overthrow the Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity, and~~

~~especially of the Divinity of our Saviour: which is so~~

~~signal and Necessary a Part of Theology, that it is by~~

~~all of the Ancient Greek Fathers, emphatically and by~~

~~all of eminency call'd *Θεολογία*. And in the Writings of~~

~~Eusebius, Athanasius, and Socrates, *Θεολογία Χριστιανική* is~~

~~assert the Divine Nature of Christ, namely against~~

~~the Arians: Especially, one place in Eusebius is remar-~~

~~able, where quoting 1 John i: he saith, * *Ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ*~~

~~*μαρτυρία ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεολογία*, The Evangelical Testi-~~

Demonstrat. Evang. Lib. 5. Proem.

A 2 •

mony

mony in this place asserts the Deity of Christ. So great a Reverence and Esteem had the Ancients for the Article of Christ's Divinity, that the whole Body of Theology had its denomination from it. Is it not prodigious then to see, that a professed Divine should explode this Grand Point of our Christian Faith; and that any Christian Man's Pen should be employ'd to Preach and Write this (and other Sound Doctrines of Christianity) out of the World? It stands amaz'd to behold some Men of Learning shut their Eyes against so bright and glorious a Truth, and either take no notice of those plain Texts of Scripture which have been always alledg'd and urg'd for the defence of the Sacred Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity, or else give them quite another Turn, and thereby put Weapons in our Adversaries Hands; and (to speak freely and plainly) they seem to have a design to oblige the Arians and Socinians, and even Deists, and Scepticks.

I will beg leave of the Reader, to bring in here and produce one very remarkable Instance of this in that late Annotation on those Words in a Phil. 6. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. Where, by the form of God, the Ancients Fathers of the Christian Church understood the Nature and Essence of God. Gregory Nyssen is positive as to this. * The form of God (saith he) is clearly the same with his Essence, for as Christ being made in the form of a Servant, was form'd in the very Essence of a Servant, and did not take upon him the naked and simple form only, as separated from the Essence, but the Essence together with the Form is signified there; so when 'tis said he was in the Form of God, the Essence is to be under-

'stud by the Form. Theodoret expressly affirms, that
 † the Nature of God is meant by his Form: and he af-
 terwards explains it by *ὁμοιότης*, the Divine Essence.
 Another assures us that, "Essence, Nature, and Form, are
 the same with the Primitive Writers. With these agrees
 Theophylact on the place, who peremptorily asserts, that
 the † Essence of God is call'd here his Form. But Dr.
 Whitby, who is wont at other times (when there is little
 occasion for it) to fill his Pages with Quotations out of
 these Writers, here omits them, and takes no notice of them.
 Why? Because he hath a mind to vent a strange upstart No-
 tion of his own, and that is this, that the Form of God is
 the Shechinah, so call'd by the Hebrews, the same with
 the *ἀἰθέρα* in the Septuagint, and the New Testament:
 It is, he saith, the Appearance of God in form of a
 Bright Cloud, and sometimes partly dark and partly
 shining, together with the presence of Angels in
 great splendor, as is described in the Old Testament.
 And accordingly, by being in the Form of God is meant,
 Christ's appearing to the Patriarchs of old before he
 was Incarnate: but when he came into the World, and
 took upon him our Nature, he never was in the Form of
 God; that is, there never was any Shechinah so di-
 stinguish him from others, he was never honoured with a
 bright Cloud or the presence of Angels. This is what the
 Dr. delivers as his Persuasion concerning the Form of
 God, in 2 Phil. 6.

But who could have expected that one, tho' but moderately conversant in the Bible, should presume to talk after this rate? Was there not at Christ's Nativity this very Shechinah? Do we not read, in 2 Luke 9. that the glory of the Lord shone at that time, and was accompanied with the presence of an Angel; and v. 11. there was with the Angel a Multitude of the Heavenly Host? Again, Do we not read, that Christ was transfigured, and his face did shine as the Sun, and his raiment was white as the Light? And a bright cloud overshadowed them, and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, &c. 17 Mat. 2. 5. and 'tis not unlikely, that Moses and Elias supplied the place of Angels, for 'tis said they appeared in Glory, 9. Luke 31. That is, in that Glorious manner which the Angelick Spirits used to be seen in. To this without doubt refers 2 Pet. 1. 17. He received from God the Father Honour and Glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent Glory. This excellent Glory was that bright Cloud before-mention'd, 17. Mat. 5. and that glorious appearance of Angels, which is call'd his Glory, 9. Luke 31, 32. Yea, Dr. Whitby himself on that Text in St. Peter expressly owns, that the majestic A^{ss}, the excellent Glory, was the bright Cloud which then appear'd, and was the constant Symbol of the Divine Presence. Yet he saith in his Annotations on 2 Phil. 6. That this Glory was never shown till after Christ's Ascension. From hence 'tis clear that the Dr. needs not any one to confute him, seeing he doth it so well himself. Again, he forgets that 'tis said at another time, that there came a voice from Heaven, 12. John 28. That is, as the People rightly thought at the hearing of it, it thundred, which supposes the Cloud before spoken of partly dark, and partly bright: and it was well guessed that an Angel spoke, v. 29: So that here is the perfect Shechi-

Shechinah which the Dr. describes, though he saith it was proper to the Old Testament, and therefore Christ never appear'd in this manner in the time of his being in this World. Moreover, he takes no notice of 1. Acts 9, 10. where we are told that a Cloud received him, and two angels in white apparel, that is, in a shining glorious manner, appear'd at the same time, v. 10. which is exactly the Shechinah, and yet the Dr. will not allow any such thing till after Christ's arriving at Heaven.

There is another Text that confounds this wild Notion of the Dr. 1 John 14. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father. Which without doubt hath relation to those glorious Appearances of Christ which I have particularly mentioned. But the Dr. to evade these plain words, thrusts this Interpretation of the place upon us, We have seen his Glory, that is, the Divinity of the Word conspicuous in the Miracles wrought by him: Which is the very Socinian Gloss on this Text, and on the other, 2 Phil. 6. where Christ is said to be in the Form of God. Yea, the Dr. himself on this latter Text takes notice, that Grotius and the Socinians say, that Christ is said to be [in the Form of God] by reason of the Miracles he wrought on Earth. But he adds, this Interpretation can't stand. And yet now here we see, that by the Form of God he understands the Power of Miracles, according to his Interpretation of 1 John 14.

But observe yet farther how he baffles all that he had said before concerning the meaning of the Form of God, which he told us was the Schechinah, and belong'd only to the Old Testament, and consequently can't relate to Christ when he was here on earth. Observe, I say, how he baffles all this, when he saith in his Annotations on 1 John

vi The PREFACE.

14. [The Word *ἡμεῖς* both such an apparent affinity both in Sound and Sense with the Hebrew *Shachan* us'd in the Old Testament when mention is made of God dwelling by the *Shechinah* or his Glorious Presence, that we have reason to believe that this Phrase relates to the Divine Nature, or to the Fulness of the Deity dwelling in Christ's Humane Nature.] Here he confesses, that the *Shechinah* or Glory which the Apostles saw, is spoken concerning Christ in the Flesh, which he had stiffly denied before. Thus we see what Contradictions and Inconsistencies are couch'd in the Dr's, strange Conceits, that our Saviour's being in the Form of God was his appearing to the Patriarchs with a Cloud and with Angels. Certainly this is an unaccountable fancy, and we see the Dr. shuffles and is ashamed of it.

But let us proceed to the next Clause in this Verse, He thought it not robbery to be equal with God; and here we shall find likewise that Dr. Whitby gratifies the Enemies of the Sacred Trinity, and more particularly of the Doctrine of the Divinity of the Second Person. For whereas this remarkable Passage was made use of against the Arians by Athanasius, Hilary, Chrysostom, Augustine, and other Fathers, the Dr. now renders it useless for that purpose, by fixing as wild a Sense on this part of the Text as he did on the other; for he translates *ὃν ἀφ' ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἰσότης*, thus, he assumed not to be like God; he took not on him that Dignity; he would not be thought to be like God. And herein he follows his Friend Grotius, who also endeavours to explain it by a Phrase in the Syriack Liturgy which is nothing to the purpose; for surely there is a vast difference between *ἀφ' ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἰσότης* and *ἀφ' ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἰσότης*. But Grotius makes a farther Attempt, and parallels this Phrase with the like in Plutarch, tho' the Dr. tells us he can't find it there. But the Dr. confesses that he finds this Expression in Heliodorus, (or rather it was found

to the READER. [vii]

and to his Hand, for he borrow'd it from a Foreign Author, Schmidius, and that Author took it from Hagedorn (and Socinian) and saith, it signifies there to cover secretly: And to this purpose he hath the confidence to show a very smutty Story out of that Romantic Author: he seems with an Air of Innocency to relate the famous Pranks of Cybele with Theagenes, is bring into the lewd conversation of Queen Artaxerxes: and he does not to mention the bloody Plot against the Young King's Life, as is the constant strain of Novels and Romances. All this is trump'd up by this Reverend Divine, for the sake of that Phrase *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν*, which he would have to be understood not in St. Paul's Sense but in Eliodorus's, as he thinks.

And yet after all, this Expression in that Writer signifies something like the Thing which the Doctor pretends to: for, The Word *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν* is not so much as mention'd, for *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν* is the Word there used, which denotes the Thing or Act; but the other signifies the Act belonging to the Thing, which makes a great difference. 2. This Author another time changes *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν* into *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν*, which is quite another thing. 3. And, even in that place which is alludg'd, instead of *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν*, other Copies read *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν*.

4. It appears hence, that the meaning of the Phrase this Author is to make a violent Effort, to prosecute a thing with Violence. The very Words are these, *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν ὡς ἀπομαρτυρεῖν ὡς ἀπομαρτυρεῖν*; Lib. 7. c. 20, it is, (taking the Verb *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν* for prosecute,) doth he fall upon it as a gainful Prey? or (taking *ἀπομαρτυρεῖν* to think) doth he not think it to be a profitable prey, worth his utmost Efforts? And so (take the Word as you please) it is apparent that this Phrase is nothing

and purpose which the Doctor design'd. But herein
manifest the Doctor's good Will: rather than he will be
obscure, he will break through Grammar and Criticism
where he will embrace the plain and obvious Sense of
apostolic Expression, he mainly runs to an odd use in
Saint Hieron. Heliodorus, so uphold a foolish, yet blas-
phemous Notion. That Christ would not be thought
God, or to be like God, or (as he otherwise would
be) not to appear like a God. This is the Doc-
trine of the Words. And when he was explaining the
same, the Form of God, which he saith in the Dis-
tinction, he boldly affirms that Christ never shew'd it
in the World: Which I have prov'd to be a plain
Falsity from several Instances I produc'd.

But for the Obstinacy of this Annotator: he lies
in the Sense of the Fathers of the Christian Church upon
Floor; and chuses rather to put off his Readers with a
groundless Fancy, than to submit to the plain and ob-
vious Meaning which our Translators, and the most judicious
Expositors present us with; namely, that the Son of God
thought it no robbery to claim Equality with his
Father: as much as to say, this is no Encroachment,
Usurpation, no Injury; but it is his Right and
Dr. Whitby will not allow this Meaning of the
Apostle; and accordingly we may observe, that Mr. Whi-
ton, Vol. 4. p. 87. quotes him on this account; and
plauds him for it, perhaps expecting that he will turn
us aside, like himself; and having gone so far, will go
a little farther, and at last shew his friendly Complacency
in the whole Arian and Socinian Scheme.

But is it not strange, prodigiously strange, that
of any Sense and Learning, should agree to pervert
the meaning of so Intelligible a Text as this is, and to
interpret that plain Expression as it is not, which

very frequent way of speaking with the Apostles? I
 would have it observ'd that it is three us'd in the very
 text, as v. 7. *ὁμοειδής*, so some things left;
 and the very same is repeated v. 8. and in the end of this
 verse we meet with another *ὁμοειδής*. And indeed the Apo-
 stle seems to delight in this manner of speaking; witness
 the following places, 2 Phil. 25. *ὁμοειδής*,
 Thessl. 2. 15. *ὁμοειδής*, 1 Tim. 1. 12.
 Heb. 11. *ὁμοειδής*, 11. Heb. 26. *ὁμοειδής*.
 And other Apostles use the way of speaking, 1 Jam. 2.
ὁμοειδής, 2 Pet. 1. 12. *ὁμοειδής*, 2 Pet. 2. 12.
ὁμοειδής, 2 Pet. 2. 19. *ὁμοειδής*, 2 Pet. 3. 15.
ὁμοειδής. And why must not *ὁμοειδής*, be
 understood by us after the like manner? I desire this may
 seriously weigh'd by all Impartial and Critical Readers,
 which number Dr. Whitby, I doubt not, would be
 ought to be.

I might take notice that he Disparages and Diminishes
 Sense of those words, *ὁμοειδής*, to be equal
 with God; for he renders them thus, to appear as God,
 to appear in the likeness of God, which calls in
 question the Reality and Truth of the Godhead of our Sa-
 viour: and besides, all the Ancient Writers of any Account
 in that *ὁμοειδής*, signifies to be in all respects
 equal with God the Father. Thus 'tis evident that
 Whitby hath, by his Annotations on this Text, un-
 justly gratified the Arians and Socinians, as he hath
 at other times in some other places of those Writings:
 I shall perhaps have occasion to shew afterwards; but at
 present I will mention but one Text more, 1 Col. 15.
ὁμοειδής is the Image of the invisible God; where
 Whitby gives us this mean sense of it; Christ is the
 Image of God, as making him conspicuous to us by
 the Divine Works he wrought: and he strangely adds,
 that hath done these Works, is upon this ac-
 count

count as much an Image of God as any thing can be. Which implies, that the Doctor hath some other thing in his Head that he thinks can be as much an Image of God as Christ is. This he vouches to be the natural import of the Phrase, namely, the Image of God; whereas something Greater and Higher is meant, namely, the same with 2 Cor. 4. 4. and 1. Heb. where the Image of God, and the express Image of his Person, import, that the Second Person in the Glorious Trinity is the exact Representation of the First Person, that he is his Substantial and Essential Image, as the Greek Fathers expound it. But Dr. Whitby, who is full of the Fathers at some other times, abandons them now, when he hath the greatest Reason to adhere to them.

I am finishing a Discourse wherein, by the Divine Assistance, I shall give the full and ample Sense of the and all those other Texts that speak of the Divinity of our Lord; and I hope to make this Catholic Doctrine good to a Certainty not inferior to that of a Demonstration. Before I commit those Papers to the Public, I am preparing the way by this Present Essay, which will give a true Account of the New Way which Mr. Whiston hath taken to commend and set off his Pernicious Doctrines, particularly with relation to the Blessed Trinity. The Books which we now at this day receive for Canonical and no others, were expressly own'd and receiv'd by the Laodicean Council, by these Ancient Writers, Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Origen, Achanasius, Nazianzen, by the 6th Synod Trullo, by Damascen, Hilary, Jerom, Rufinus, Prælatius; Gregory the Great: and, in a word,

* Epiphani. Hæres. 69. Cyril. Dial. de Trinitate. Basil. Epist. Nazianzen. de Filio, Orat. 5.

of Christ both generally and universally owned the
 of the Old and New Testament as the undoubted Co-
 of Faith, without diminishing or increasing the Num-
 of them. But Mr. Whiston, who thinks himself
 for than the rest of the Christian World, pretends to do
 as by presenting us with another New Testament;
 at least with a Great Addition to that which we have
 , and by that means he hopes to establish Christian
 Strines, which he fancies are contain'd in those Addi-
 al Writings. Seeing this is the New Course he takes,
 without doubt he esteems it to be the best and most
 (qual for his purpose) I have endeavour'd in the follow-
 Discourse to show the Vanity and Invalidity of this
 Project, and to quash the Credit of his Authorities and
 Simonies. So that I hope Mr. Whiston will be a
 nding Caution to us for the future not to make such Wri-
 the Authors of our Faith. Of our Religion.

I leave the other Parts of his Books to be particularly
 sider'd and answer'd by others, who, I fear, will but
 spend their Time, if they nicely and formally Insist upon
 that he hath amass'd together, to make his Cause look
 For my part, I thought it was sufficient to take away
 main Foundation, that is, the Authority he builds up-
 and thereby to ruin his whole Structure.

I most solemnly protest, that I take no delight in making
 flections on the Performances of my Brethren: but I
 rtily wish there were no Occasion for it, and I'm griev'd
 there is. But since there is this fresh Occasion given
 , I'm oblig'd, as I am a Member, much more as I am
 Minister of the Church of England, which I heartily
 erence and esteem, to take notice of the gross Deviat-
 of such Writers from the Articles of our Church; and
 ould act most falsely and treacherously if I did not be-
 ve my self thus. I am not now diving into the Success
 of

of the Christian Church, and the Protestant Cause in
 Critical Juncture: But this we may justly fear, that
 we have our first Love, and abandon our Primitive
 Doctrines and Practices; it will prove destructive to
 Wharfore let us be careful to revive our lost Truth,
 to bear Testimony to those Evangelical Principles
 have been corrupted in this degenerate Age. When the
 of the Rights came out, we were greatly alarmed,
 all Pulpits and Presses were set on work to cry down
 Blasphemous Piece: But now when Mr. Whiston
 and boldly denies one of the Principal Articles of our Chri-
 stian Faith, and calls the Arian Heresy Primitive Chri-
 stianity, I don't observe that our Brethren are so
 and Active, so Warm and Zealous as they were on the
 Occasion; now, I hope, as if any Rights and Privileges
 were more at their Heart than the Fundamentals and Es-
 sentials of our Religion. Or, do some spare Mr. Whiston's
 Books, because he makes so much use of the Apostles O-
 rons, the Constitutions, and Ignatius' Epistles, and
 Writings are the great Basis of some of the Doctrines and
 Practices which they are pleas'd with? However it
 I think our Learned and Pious Ecclesiastics are oblig'd
 bewail our late Defections from the Primitive Doctrine
 and more particularly to show their Dislike and Abhorrence
 of this late Insolent Attempt against the Blessed and Glori-
 ous Trinity.

Indeed all the Theological Writings of this Frankish Au-
 thor are of a dangerous Nature, and seem to design the
 Shaking of our Christian Principles. Pardon me if I say
 There hath not been such an Ecclesiastic Magar bred in the
 Northern Country these many Years; and if it grows pro-
 portionably to what it hath done already, it will be very
 Affrighting, and will prove very Troublesome and Dis-
 ciplinary to the World. This Writer hath unhappily re-
 corded himself a scandalous Instance of treating on the
 Highest

to the READER. xiiij

*Points with Prejudice and Prepossession, with kind-
a Party (yea a baffled one) with Neglect of the
Oracles, and all at the Cost of Truth and Probity.
rious Consideration of which may excuse my Zeal
concernedness on this Occasion: and I hope what I
offer'd on this Head will not be displeasing to those
who have a True Taste of Religious Matters: but as for
whose Relish is vitiated and debauch'd, I shall not
least give my self the trouble to know what their
are about this my Present Performance.*

ERRATA

Page 3. marg. lin. ult. read verily. P. 2. l. 4. from the
 1. count. insert before P. 12. l. 12. insert after before
 P. 19. l. 11. for and. P. 29. l. 12. for and. P. 34. l. 11.
 P. 34. l. 1. for the. P. 34. l. 1. for the. P. 34. l. 1.
 out the list of. P. 41. l. 1. for (inserting. P. 42. l. 9. l. 11.
 P. 42. l. 11. for the. P. 42. l. 11. for the. P. 42. l. 11.
 said, insert relating to the. P. 42. l. 11. for the. P. 42. l. 11.
 said. P. 42. l. 11. for the. P. 42. l. 11. for the. P. 42. l. 11.
 the Office and Employment of what kind the Office is in the
 notwithstanding the former's Office. P. 44. l. 7. and
 fore John insert d. and after it 44. P. 44. l. 10. from the
 term, for what.

ERRA:

I have not only Perused and Perused, with kind
 a Party (see a bustled one) with respect of the
 matter, and all at the Cost of Time and Pains.
 great Satisfaction of which may excite my Zeal
 to the Cause, and I hope to be
 able to do this Head will not be dissatisfied to those
 who a True Test of Religious Matters: but as for
 those who are in a different and debauched, I shall not
 best give myself the trouble to know what their
 are about this my Perseverance.

ERRATA

PAg. 3. marg. lin. ult. read *legit*. P. 5. l. 4. from the
 com, insert *Person*. P. 12. l. 19. insert *these* before *by*
 P. 19. l. 11. for *to* r. *and*. P. 29. l. 19. r. *Augustine* for *Aug*
 P. 33. l. 6. r. *the* for *the*. l. 21. r. *various*. P. 34. l. 11.
 out the first of. P. 41. l. 1. r. *suggesting*. P. 45. l. 9. r. *the*
 P. 51. marg. r. *insert*. P. 55. l. 8. from the bottom
saith, insert *relating to the Fathers*. P. 57. l. 11. after the
laid aside, insert, [*Not but that Her Majesty, as Supreme, may*
best Office and Employments of what kind she pleases on Her
notwithstanding the foremention'd Canons.] P. 64. l. 7. and
fore *John* insert 6, and after it 44. P. 64. l. 10. from the
 com, for *was* r. *were*.

Reflections on Mr. Whiston

1

OBSERVATIONS
AND
REFLECTIONS, &c.

IT hath been in every one's Mouth that *Africa* is always bringing forth *Monsters*; but it is no less true, that *England* is, as fertile in this sort of Productions: for Strange and Heretical Opinions are the worst of *Monsters*. One hath endeavour'd to persuade us, that we have no *Souls* different from our *Bodies*. Another labours to prove, that *Human Souls* are not of an *Immortal Nature*, and he pretends to support this Doctrine by Scripture and Fathers. One crowds all our Christian Belief into *One single Article*. We are assaulted by *Enthusiastic Impostors*, and Pretenders to a *Propheick Spirit*. *Deists* and *Scepticks* every where lift up their *Monstrous Crests*. All *Mysteries* in the Christian Religion are laught at. The *True Rights* of the Christian Church have been shock'd by other Hands. Not long ago the *Antitrinitarians* disturb'd the Peace of our Church, and set the Pens of our Clergy on work; but now lately one of our own Ecclesiasticks appears in defence of those Heretics, and under the shape of an *Arian* takes upon him to be Protector and Guaranty of that Cause; but he more particularly strikes at the

B

Divinity

Reflections on Mr. Whiston's

Divinity of our Blessed Lord, blasphemously asserting him to be a *Creature* made in Time, and not of the same Nature with God the Father. In this Execrable Attempt he doth not *directly* make use of Reason and Scripture (the Two great Sources of arguing in all Theological Matters) but he flies to Human Testimony and Authority, and undertakes to maintain his Post by the Assistance and Suffrage of the Primitive Writers of the Christian Church. This being the Way which he hath chosen (before all others) to prove his Point, I will make it my business at present briefly to examine it; and to demonstrate the Invalidity of it from these following Reflections and Observations.

I. Observe, That Mr. *Whiston* makes use of *Unwarrantable* and *Suspected Authors* to defend his Opinion; which cannot but be look'd upon by Wise and Judicious Men as an inexcusable Fault. We were told long since by the Learned Patriarch of Constantinople, that tho' the Author of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, which goes under the Name of St. Clement, doth * not plainly and openly blaspheme Christ, when he mentions him he uses Words and Expressions that are unbecoming his Divinity, and are not sublime enough and therefore he is a Writer that one would not chuse to quote. A Judicious † Modern Critic upon perusing this Epistle tells us that it hath many Words and Things in it that discover it to be adulterate and corrupted; yet Mr. *Whiston* thinks it will serve well enough to baffle Christ's Divinity.

* ἐν τῇ τῆς θεοπροφητείας ἀνυπόστατος αἰσῶνα πρὸς αὐτὸν φωνάζει; ἢ ἐν τῇ ἀπαγγελίᾳ πρὸς αὐτὸν φωνάζει; καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ λατρευομένων. Phot. B.
† Bignon. Epist. ad H. Grot.

Primitive Christianity Reviv'd. 3

Barnabas's Epistle is reckon'd by (a) *Eusebius* and (b) *Jerom.* who are thought to be good Judges, to be Apocryphal. (c) *Nicephorus* is of their mind, And, it is Archbishop (d) *Usher's* Judgment that it was not writ by the Apostle of that Name, nor in his Time, and that the Author of it is not known. It is prov'd by Archbishop *Land* to be spurious, in his *Epistle to Hugh Menard* a *Benedictine Monk*: and one Reason he assigns (which *Daille* and others have pursued) is, that this *Epistle* speaks of the Destruction of *Jerusalem* as past, whereas it was not so when *Barnabas* was alive. The Learned (e) *Sorbonic Dr.* in his Notes upon this *Epistle*, acquaints us, that he cannot own it as Genuine, that is, to be the Work of this Apostle *Barnabas*, but of some other: and he adds, that it abounds with *Strain'd Allegories*, *Fables* of certain *Animals*, *strange Interpretations of Scripture*, which ruin the Credit of it. But it is an Authentic Piece with *Mr. Whiston*, because he thinks it favours his wild Opinion.

Hermas's Pastor is condemn'd as adulterate by (f) *Tertullian*, and he saith, 'tis adjudg'd to be Apocryphal and False by the consent of all Churches. (g) *Origen* doubts of the Authority of it. (h) *We must know*, saith *Eusebius*, that this Book is not receiv'd by some, and can't be placed among the Writings that are own'd and approv'd of. And more plainly in another place; (i) *Let this Book*

(a) Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 25.

(b) De Scriptorib. Eccles. & in Epist. ad Latam.

(c) Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 46.

(d) Jac. Armachan. de Barnabæ Epistola Præmonitio.

(e) Cotelerius in Barnab.

(f) De Pudicitia. cap. 10.

(g) Homil. 8. in Num. Hom. 1. in Psal. 37.

(h) Ἰστοῦν ὡς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς πρὸς τὴν ἀντιλήψιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ἐν τοῖς ἀποκρυφίοις τῶν βιβλίων. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3 c. 3.

(i) Ἐν τισίν τοις βιβλίοις καὶ τῇ τῆς χριστεύου ἀποστολῆς. Lib. 3. c. 25.

4 Reflections on Mr. Whiston's

which is Entitled the Pastor be placed among the Spurious. (a) Athanasius and (b) Rufinus reckon it among the Apocryphal Writings. Hear what Jerom saith of it, (c) *Liber iste Apocryphus Stultitia condemnandus est*. The Council in Rome, held in Gelasius's time, unanimously voted it to be Apocryphal. (d) Possevinus declares, that the most Learned Men account it supposititious. Whoever sees (e) Blondel's Character of Hermas, will not think him an Author fit to be quoted; tho' Mr. Whiston likes him because he thinks he talks like an *Arian*. One wou'd think that Tatian is but an indifferent Author to quote on so sublime a Subject as the Divinity of Christ. He was the Founder of the Sect of the *Encratites*, he denied the Immortality of Human Souls, that is, he held that they are not in their own Nature Immortal, but that they would die with the Body if some extraordinary thing did not hinder it. Mr. Dodwell borrow'd some of his Notions hence, which a very Learned Divine of our Church hath once and again confuted. He hath other Conceits which are very odd and indigested; so that this Writer might very well have been omitted by Mr. Whiston.

And so might *Athenagoras*, who in his *Apology for the Christians* (which is quoted by Mr. Whiston) hath very unwarrantable Passages, as that the Lust which the good Angels bore to Women was the cause of their Apostasy and Downfall; that the Good Angels are to be Worshipp'd. He excessively and extravagantly magnifies Celibacy both in Men and

(a) De Incarnat. Verbi.

(b) In Symbol. Apost.

(c) In Habak. cap. I. v. 14.

(d) Apparat in verbo Pastor.

(e) In Apologia.

Women: he is over-lavish in his Thoughts about the Free Will and Natural Power of Man. *Irenaeus* puts him into the Catalogue of *Heretics*; but for want of better Authors our *new Arian* thought fit to cite him.

He makes use also of *Melito*; of whom we have only some imperfect Fragments, and therefore nothing can be gathered thence. I could observe, that neither *Eusebius* nor *Jerom*, who give us an account of all Ancient Ecclesiastical Authors of any Note, take any notice of this Writer.

Mr. *Whiston* is pleas'd to borrow something from *Theophilus Antiochenus*, tho' he hath very unsafe Notions, such as shew him to be not settled in his Perswasions, even about the lesser Things in Religion; who then would listen to him on the Highest Theme? But when Mr. *Whiston's* Hand is in, he cares not what Writings he makes use of to uphold his Heretical Scheme.

For the same purpose he quotes the *Canons of the Apostles*, (as they are call'd) and concludes them to be Authentic, because he imagines he finds something in them that patronizes his Errors. But better Men than he have had a very mean opinion of these Writings: They are *Apocryphal*, saith *Gelasius*, in the Roman Council, *Dist. 16*. Even *Bellarmin*, *Baronius*, and *Possesine*, reckon the last Thirty-five of these Canons to be spurious. The Learned Bishop *Beveridge*, hath said as much for the Body of these Canons, as is possible to be said by any Man; but it is far from convincing an unprejudic'd of the real Antiquity and Genuineness of them: And he himself grants, that some of those Canons are Corrupted and Interpolated. How then can

(*) Codex. Can. Illustratus.

6 *Reflections on Mr. Whiston's*

they be relied upon? Are they *Genuine* notwithstanding that? To say no more, I request the Reader to consult what (a) the *Centuriators of Magdeburg* have said on this Head: he will find, that (as heavy Authors as they are thought to be by some) they have irrefragably prov'd, from Variety of Arguments, that the *Apostolical Canons* are counterfeit; and that none of the Holy and Inspired Apostles, or their Companions, were the Authors of those Superstitious Rites and Usages which are therein contain'd. And whereas these *Canons* are inserted into the Last Chapter of the Last Book of the *Constitutions of the Apostles*, and are attributed to the Apostles themselves by the Author of these *Constitutions*, I shall by and by destroy the Pretences of that Book; and thence it will follow, that the *Canons* which we have been speaking of are of no value, they being supported by the *Constitutions*.

Another Spurious Book which Mr. *Whiston* makes use of is the *Recognitions*, ascrib'd by some to *Clement the Roman*, which he vouches to be an undeniable Attestation to the most Sacred Authority of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and consequently to whatever is said there. Yet, among all good Authors, these *Recognitions* have been exploded, and have been thought to be of no Credit. The Great Ecclesiastical Historian condemns them as Apocryphal, and assures us (b) that none of the *Antients*, or *Modern Writers of the Church in his time*, made use of Testimonies taken from these Books. (c) *St. Jerom* saith the same, and he takes notice of *Eusebius's* disallowing these Writings. The Council

(a) Cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 7.

(b) Μὴτε ἀρχαίον, οὐτε τὸ ἔσθ' ἡμᾶς περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς οὐχ ὑπομνήσεως τῆς ἐκ αὐτῶν συνήχουσι μαρτυρίας. *Euseb Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 3*

(c) Catalog. Scriptor. Eccles. cap. 1.

of Rome, under *Gelasius*, voted them Apocryphal. The great (a) Cardinal is forc'd to give his Suffrage here. The famous Annalist cries out against the Recognitions, because of the (b) monstrous Lies and mad Dotages that Book is stuff'd with; which, he saith, are not only to be disapprov'd of by the Learned, but by all that have the least skill in Ecclesiastical Matters. And (c) afterwards he approves of *Gelasius's* Censuring these Books; and farther declares, that he doth not think fit to make use of them in his Annals, because all wise Men that have accurately read them, know that they abound with foolish and idle Fables. Hear what another Judicious Writer hath determin'd concerning these Books, (d) In them, saith he, there are many things uncertain, many fabulous, and some that are repugnant to Catholic doctrine. Whosoever impartially peruses them will agree to this, and acknowledge that these Writings are a Rhapsody of silly Stories, a Fardle of ridiculous and Romantic Disputes. Thus the greatest Doctors of the Church of Rome reject this Book; and yet Mr. *Whiston*, who would be accounted a good Protestant, hath a great Veneration for it, and makes use of its Authority to help him in defending the *Arian* Heresy. But I shall carry this Observation on further, and shew how he thrusts upon us several other Authors whose Credit is justly questionable.

II. *Ignatius's Epistles* and the *Apostolical Constitutions* are his greatest and choicest Resource; and therefore, in the next place, let us look into these Authors, and see what that Precious Treasure is which he so

(a) Bellarmin de Pontif. Rom lib 2. cap. 3.

(b) Annal. An. D 51.

(c) Ad annum 102.

(d) Sixt. Senens. Bibliothec in Vocabulo Clement.

8 *Reflections on Mr. Whiston's*

boasts of in them. In his *Dissertation* on the *Epistles* of *Ignatius* he runs counter not only to *Salmasius* and others, who hold that *all the Epistles* which go under *Ignatius's* Name are spurious; but he contradicts the Opinion of *Vossius*, *Usher*, *Hammond*, *Pearson*, *Bull*, who assert the *Lesser Epistles* to be genuine. Such an Universal Adversary is this Gentleman, and he saw this was requisite in order to the compassing his design. Here then we may take notice how Authors, according to their particular Fancy, make use of these *Epistles* of *Ignatius*. The *Roman* Doctors stiffly maintain the *Genuineness* of them, merely to patronize some *Popish* Doctrines which they imagine are here deliver'd, as that there is a *True and Proper Priesthood*, and a *Proper Sacrifice* under the Gospel, because here is mention of an *Altar*: and they alledge a *Passage* in the *Epistle* to the Church of *Smyrna* to prove the *Corporeal Presence* of *Christ* in the Sacrament. *Belarmine* and *Baronius* more especially, make great use of these *Epistles* for the authorizing and supporting several of their *Superstitious Rites*, *Opinions* and *Practices*.

Others keep up the Authority of these Writings, in order to the proving the *Antiquity* of the *Episcopal Government* in the Church, and upholding the distinction of *Bishops* from *Presbyters*, and so to knock *John Calvin* on the head.

And now comes *Mr. Whiston*, and asserts the *Antiquity* and *Authority* of these *Epistles* to another and far different End; that is, to establish his *Arian* Notions by help of some Expressions in these Writings, which he fancies make for him, even when really they do not.

But these different Views and Hopes must needs be disappointed, because the whole Set of these *Epistles* is to be suspected as *corrupted* and *adulterated*, even not excepting the *Lesser* ones, which are but

Extracts

Extracts and Abridgments (as Mr. *Whiston* saith
 rightly) of the other Larger ones; and therefore if
 the former are deprav'd and adulterated, it is not to
 be question'd that the latter are so too. I know this
 will not be digested by some Men, but to me it is
 very plain and evident: and would be so to them,
 if they would be free and impartial in their Judg-
 ments, and open their Eyes to see that a Cheat is
 at work upon them. We must know then that Learned
 Gentleman *Isaac Vossius* was a Traveller in his young
 days, and was upon the hunt after Old Manuscripts:
 he chanc'd to light upon *Ignatius's* Epistles in the
 Duke of *Florence's* Library, and he brings a Copy of
 it over with him, and it passes for Infalible. Now
 nothing but *deus* is cried, and this far-fetch'd Trea-
 sure is admir'd and idoliz'd, as if the *Florentine* Li-
 brary had made it Divine. The Admirers of Old
 MSS. took it upon Trust, and never so much as put
 the Young Gentleman (so far as I have heard) on
 proving that this Exemplar was sincere and true. He
 tells them that he had it out of the *Medicean* Library,
 and that is enough. Who can blame him for cry-
 ing up the Credit of a Writing of which he was the
 first Inventor, and Editor? Those that are acquaint-
 ed with this Author's Writings, need not be told how
 assuming and Positive he is, and therefore 'twas not
 strange to contradict him: and be sure none of those
 would venture to do it, who for certain and particu-
 lar Reasons were glad that the Genuineness of those
 Epistles was establish'd.

The famous *Primate*, tho' he was catch'd in this
 snare, in his *Prefaces* before these Epistles, speaks so
 obscurely and darkly, that one may easily perceive
 he was not satisfied in his own Judgment, whether
 these that are said to be *Genuine*, were really so: and
 he dissents from his Friend *Isaac Vossius* about *Ignatius's*
 Epistle to *Polycarp*, for he condemns it as Fictitious,
 tho'

tho' the other approves of it. Nay, I must let the Reader know that *Vossius* himself was not satisfied about the Authority of this Epistle to *Polycarp*: otherwise he would not have dropt such words as these (a) *I don't deny that there are some things in it which make it Suspected*. So that we see there is no Certainty about these Writings, no, not in the Judgment of these Editors themselves.

And truly any Man that without Prejudice peruses both Copies, that which they call the *True*, and that which they say is *Supposititious*, will see that *this* rather than *that*, hath the greater probability of being Genuine; for *that* is plainly a lame and imperfect Thing, and a mere Curtailing of the other. The first Transcriber had a mind to save himself some labour, and thought it was enough to write out the *Main* of the Epistles, which it is likely he believ'd were none of *Ignatius's*, tho' they bear his Name, and therefore he needed not be very Elaborate and Nice in copying them out. We may then impute this Maiming of the Epistles either to the Laziness of the Scribes, or to their Honesty: they would not trouble the World with too much of that which they thought was Feign'd. But is it not strange and incredible, that those very Learned Men *Vossius* and *Usher*, should prefer an Imperfect Copy before the other that is Entire? No: this is easily resolv'd, for we may observe that none are more easily imposed upon than those that are addicted to the Study of *Antiquity*; for they are so charm'd with the Love of it, that they stand ready and prepar'd to be deceiv'd. I could give a pretty many Instances of this, but I will not bear hard upon these Persons.

(a) *Voss. Notæ in Epist. ad Polycarp.*

Bishop Pearson was a Great Man, and seem'd to
 very Wary, which makes me wonder when I see
 how he was impos'd upon in this Affair, and strikes
 with Archbishop Usher and Vossius, as appears in
Vindication of Ignatius's Epistles. He undertakes
 to produce *Testimonies* for them out of Writers for
 several Ages, but I conceive he doth not prove what
 might have been expected from him; that is, that
 these Epistles which we now have, are the same that
 those Authors mention. And as for *Testimonies*, I
 can produce as many for *Dionysius the Areopagite's*
 writings, which yet (a) Bishop Pearson holds to be
 spurious; that is, they were none of them writ by
 the same Author, whose Name they bear. So for
Jerome's Pastor, the Witnesses are many, and very
 ancient, and it happens well that they are produced
 by the Bishop (b) himself: yet he doth not own that
 book to be Genuine. Wherefore this Excellent
 Man's Reasoning from Testimonies, must, according
 to his own Arbitrement, be invalid and insignifi-
 cant.

And as to other ways of Arguing used by this most
 learned Prelate, I can't believe that he thought them
 of any weight. And the Apprehensions which
 he discovers at other times may convince us of this;
 he freely confesses that it is difficult to separate
 the Spurious Parts of the Epistles of *Ignatius* from the
 true ones, and consequently to know which are
 true, and which are False. His own Words are
 these, (c) *There is little or nothing yet done towards the
 separating the Genuine Parts from the Corrupt ones by any
 certain Criterion: so that what Daillé hath observ'd, is*

-
- a) Proœmium ante Vindicias.
 - b) Vindic. Pars 1. cap. 3, & 4.
 - c) Proœmium ante Vindicias.

true; namely, that unless Usher and Vossius had their Exemplar, there would be no longer any hopes of knowing and making a difference between the Interpolator and the True Writer. Bishop Pearson confesses, and tho' it seems to refer to the time before the *lian* Original was brought over, yet it is as applicable to the time since.

Further, Tho' this Admirable Writer sticks for the Authority of the Epistles which *Vossius* brought to light, yet he acknowledges that (a) even the Epistles are interpolated and corrupted; and he instances in this, that the Quotations out of the Fathers are misrepresented, and some of them are not to be found at all; and he adds, that several things are inserted which are agreeable to Antiquity, nor to Ignatius's Mind, nor to the Tenour of the Epistles. This plainly shews that Lordship had some Regret on his Mind, and was inclin'd to yield all up, even whilst he was defending the Epistles. And I might observe likewise, that it fully contradicts the Archbishop of Armagh's *Ignatius's* Epistle to Polycarp; so that we may discern that he was no thorough-paced *Ignatian*, tho' he would seem to be such. I am sorry, that I have occasion to say these things concerning so venerable a Person, and one of such extraordinary Merits, and who particularly deserv'd so much of Our Church. I am heartily troubled, to find one of such infinite Reading, of such great Acquaintance with Authors, and especially of such Skill in the most Antient ones, easily byass'd and deceiv'd, and taking upon him the defence of so weak a Cause. We must impute to the Measures which were then set him; and to the Ambition he had in his most Learned Breast, to get the Victory over Monsieur *Daille*, one of the Chief

(a) *Proem. ad Vindicias. cap. 4.*

the Gallio Reform'd Church, who had prov'd, these Epistles bear not the Genuine Character of Antiquity; and at last to make way for that Honour in the Church which he had so Learnedly supported. But Mr. *Whiston*, upon other Considerations, (and those very bad ones,) hath defended the Authority and Sincerity of those Epistles, and not with equal Reason and Success. To conclude what I have so say concerning Ignatius's Writings; Seven of his Epistles are said to be genuine by *Vossius*, *Hamond*, *Pearson*, *Bull*, besides many Catholics: the Seventh, namely, that to *Poly*, is spurious, saith *Usher*; but the other Six he owns of. They are all of them supposititious, say *Usher*, *Daille*, and *Salmasius*; but *Morinus*, a Great Learned Critic, is of Mr. *Whiston*'s Opinion; saying, he saith, compared the former Copy of the Epistles with the latter one, that is, with That which *Vossius* brought from *Florence*, he determines, (a) *The Old Edition of Ignatius's Epistles presents with the Genuine Text, but the New one with that which is Lame and Interpolated.* This is the Disagreement among Writers. If I may be permitted to offer my Judgment, it is this; It is not to be doubted that there were some Epistles wrote by that Good Bishop *Ignatius*; for (b) *Irenaeus*, (c) *Jerom*, with *Arbasius* and *Chrysostom*, make mention of them; but afterwards they were miserably corrupted and altered; and several things were inserted into them which are unworthy of that Pious Martyr, and are inconsistent with the Age and the State of those times; for which reason

(a) Exercit. Biblic.

(b) Hist. Eccl. Lib. 3. c. 36.

(c) De viris illustrib. cap. 16.

those Persons who have examin'd these Writings with some care, have pronounc'd them, as the main part Spurious. This we find done by *Nestor* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, by *Anastasia* *Roman* Library-keeper, by the *Magdeburgenses*, *Parker* in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*; and by *Cassiodorus* his Censure on *Ignatius*, who hath by solid Arguments prov'd these Epistles to be suppositions, which reason they are the fitter for Mr. *Whiston* to prove his Spurious Doctrine by.

III. I proceed next to offer what I have observed concerning the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which is another sandy Foundation, which Mr. *Whiston* builds his Opinion upon. And, indeed he may well join these *Constitutions* and *Ignatius's Epistles* together, for it is not improbable, that the same Hand had shap'd them both into what they are; at least a great part of these Epistles, which go under *Ignatius's* Name, had the Compiler of the *Constitutions* for their Author, as the Learn'd (a) *Usher* has shewn from several Instances out of both, demonstrating that *Bishop Pearson* agrees to this, telling us that *there is a great likeness and conspiracy between Ignatius's Epistles, especially the interpolated ones, and the Constitutions, that not only Turrianus and Bovius take notice of it to prove the Antiquity of the Constitutions, but Usher also observes it, to prove thence, that the same Hand was the Interpolator of Clement and Ignatius.* Wherefore, I having before shew'd the Forgery of the *Ignatian Epistles*, the *Constitutions* must needs fall in the same course.

(a) *Prologomena ad Ignat.*

(b) *Vindic. Part I. cap. 4.*

But I will give the Reader farther satisfaction as to the Suppositiousness of these Books. The Great and Famous Ecclesiastical Historian reckons them as *νῦν ῥηθῆναι*. So doth *Gelasius*, Bishop of *Rome*, at the latter end of the Fifth Century, in his *Decrees*, c. 15. So doth the Second Canon of the Sixth Synod in *Trullo*, expressly affirming, concerning the Constitutions, (b) that there was of old inserted into them, by the Heterodox, certain Adulterate Doctrines, and far from Piety, which tend to the mischief of the Church. Afterwards, these are by that Council call'd (c) the Writings of Heretical Folly. And the known Commentator on the Councils declares, that these Writings (d) were adulterated by impious Men, to the damage of more simple and innocent Readers, and therefore they were rejected by that Synod. And *Balsamen* takes notice of this Synodical Censure in his Notes on the last Canon of the Apostles. *Photius*, the judicious Censor of Authors, gives us a very bad Character of these Constitutions, charging them with the (e) worst sort of Fiction, with perverting some Parts of the Scripture, and with *Arianism*. *Ben Bovius*, an Italian Bishop, who was one of the first Translators of these Books, and holds them to be writ by *Clement* himself, yet in his Notes upon the Eighteenth Chapter of the Fifth Book acknowledges, that there are Passages in these Writings that are Adulterated, and New, and are to be blotted out, as

(a) Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 3. cap. 5.

(b) Ὅτι ποταλά, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπεροβῶν, ἐπὶ λόγῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῆς ξύνης τῆς ἐκκλησίας (τῆς ἐσθλῆς) περιετέθησαν.

(c) πρὸς αἱρετικῆς ψευδολογίας κινήματα.

(d) Περὶ τῶν ἀσθενῶν ἐνοχουμένων, οἷς βλάβην τῶν ἀπλοῶν ἐποίησαν, καὶ ἐννοητικῶς ἀπεκλήθησαν. Zonaras in 80 Can. Apost.

(e) Κακοπλασία, κατὰ τὸ Δευτερονομίῳ ὄρεσι, Ἀρσενισμός: ed. 113.

being

16 Reflections on Mr. Whiston's

being contrary to the Precepts of the Apostles. It is the Judgment of Possévinus, (a) That these Writings were not compiled by Clement, and that they are Apostolical and Genuine.

Even Bellarmine reckons them (b) to be of use in the Church of Rome: He enumerates several erroneous Doctrines and Practices in them, and one particular is manifestly false, he saith: Then adds, *Habentur alia non pauca quæ abhorrent veritati.* The Learned Cotelierus, in his Notes on Constitutions condemns them as Spurious, and does not own them to be writ by Clement: and in his *Life* before his Collection of the Works of the Fathers, he pronounces many things in them to be false and dubious, tho' not without a mixture of Truth. No Man that reads Blondell, can ever after believe the Constitutions to be Genuine, his Arguments against them are so strong and convincing.

Bishop Pearson tells us that (c) the Eight Books of the Constitutions which we now have, were patch'd up to Epiphanius's time, out of diverse old Didascaliae and Discourses, changed and interpolated by some Hereticks who did not know how to spend their Hours better. This is the Sense of that excellent Man, the great Ornament of our Church; and we see that other judicious Writers are of his Mind: and 'tis not to be doubted, that all others would concur with it if they were not prepossess'd, and bias'd by prejudicial Thoughts. I will in the Last Place, add the Sentiment of the most Learned Bishop of Worcester, now living: (d) *The Makers of these Constitutions,* saith he

(a) Apparat. in vocab. Clement.

(b) In Ecclesiâ Latinâ nullum fere nomen habent. De Sententiis Eccl. de Sancto Clemente.

(c) Vindic. S. Ignat. Epist. Part I. cap. 4.

(d) In his Letter to Mr. Whiston.

are such as made no conscience of abusing the Names and
 Authorities of the Apostles of Christ. I can't think of it
 without indignation, how they made them their Puppets to
 do whatsoever they were pleas'd to say in their Names,
 and indeed, of the Things they made them say, were such
 as the Apostles had said in their Writings. Other Things
 they said were agreeable enough to their Writings (such
 as they must take in for their own Credit). But other
 Things they made them say that were very Disagreeable, and
 plainly False and Inconsistent with what we have in
 Scripture. It is hard to guess what they should drive
 in their writing such Things; but if it were only to get
 away by Publishing such Books as they knew all Men
 would be ready to buy, there was a Double Wickedness in it,
 abusing those Sacred Names which they assumed, and
 selling them that bought their Counterfeit Wares. From
 particular Instances the Bishop proves the Book to
 be a Cheat and a Juggle, and finds reason to call the
 Author of it an impudent Fellow, which he would not
 have done if he had not been fully perswaded that
 it was a bold Impostor. He alledges those Great
 Names, Usher and Pearson, to attest what he saith,
 and concludes thus, That these should be the Counten-
 ance of Clement, I think never came into the Head of
 a Learned Man, since Learning came to flourish in this
 Age, save only such as having given up themselves to
 it, have thought they could do great Service to the Church
 by such Things as they had found in that Book. This is
 exactly Mr. Whiston's Case, and therefore we are
 to wonder that he is such a fierce Advocate for
 these Writings. He endeavours to prove them to be Apostolical
 and Genuine, and Canonical Scripture, because
 unless we allow this, we must suppose, that Christ left

his Church unprovided in the principal Contents of all, and did never give Her any certain Body or System of Law by which she was to be govern'd and guided in after-ages. And, that the New Testament is no Body or System of Law, he attempts to prove thus; The Four Gospels contain only the History, the Miracles, and Prædication of our Lord before his Resurrection and Ascension. The Acts of the Apostles, and their Epistles, do only contain Occasional Histories concerning the spreading of the Gospel, or mention Occasional Directions, and Admonitions upon several Emergencies, P. 162. And he concludes, that we strangely mistake the Nature and Design of these Scripture Writings, if we often turn them into the proper Rule of Faith and Practice among Christians. The ground of this is, because they are no Body or System. I perceive that this way of Arguing is very plausible to some Readers, and therefore I will give a full and satisfactory Answer to it.

And First, we may observe the Personages of the Man: He and his Friends are wont to laugh at *Cruels* and *Systems*, but now he presses, that the *Acts* and *Laws* of Christ, and his Apostles, must be reduced into a *System*: And if we have not this, then, all the Books of the New Testament signify nothing. This is cross enough, and contradictory to those Gentlemen's Notion of *Systems* which they have heretofore profess'd. They were things despised and ridiculed by them, but now on a sudden they are highly valued and extolled, and even become necessary in the present case. It is urged that a Formal System is absolutely required, and that the *Gospels*, *Acts*, and *Epistles*, are not sufficient for directing our Faith and Practice without being shaped into a *System*; but I will briefly evince the Truth of the contrary, and demonstrate that they are sufficient, yea, *Complete* and *Perfect* without this.

In the *Four Gospels* are all the Rules and Directions
 out Principles and Doctrine, *Worship, Practice,* and
Worship, which were requisite for the Apostles and
 Disciples, and other Christians to know at that time.
 and they had the infallible Master and Teacher
 with them, to interpret and explain every thing to
 them, so that there was no need of the Formality of
 System.

The *Acts of the Apostles*, and *Epistles*, present us with
 many of the same Divine Truths and Rules, but
 with some Additions to farther Explications. More
 particularly in the *Acts of the Apostles*, there are re-
 corded the Prayers and Devotions, the Sermons and
 Doctrines, the Worship and the Ecclesiastical Polity
 of the First Christians. In this Book we have a
 Model and Platform of the Primitive Church of
 Christ. Here are all the Parts and Branches of its
 Government, all the Offices and Ministries belong-
 ing to it set down exactly; and we are taught, here
 how the Christian Churches in all future Ages are
 to be managed. These things are delivered in way
 of a *Narrative or History*; and set down as they hap-
 pen'd, as was most proper; who then can think it ne-
 cessary that they should be ranged under particular
 Heads, and be brought into distinct Chapters and Di-
 visions by themselves, as is the manner of *Systems*?
 In the *Epistles*, all the Doctrines of Christianity
 are faithfully represented; all Errors and Disorders
 are reform'd; all Vices and Immoralities are cor-
 rected; all material Controversies in Religion are
 decided; all practical Duties are prescrib'd. We
 can't name One Principle of our Christian Faith,
 nor One fundamental Article of our Holy Religion,
 but it is here asserted and explained. We can't men-
 tion one necessary Duty of our Lives, nor any one
 except for the regulating our Thoughts, Words,
 and Actions, but it is here described. We can think

of no Virtues and Graces about which there are no Directions. The Mutual and Reciprocal Duties of Princes and their Subjects, of Spiritual Pastors and their Flocks, of Parents and their Children, of Husbands and their Wives, of Masters and their Servants, and of all particular Ranks and Conditions of Men are distinctly set forth. In short, there is nothing appertaining to Natural or Moral Religion and more especially supernatural and reveal'd, that is not fully deliver'd in these Writings; and the whole makes up a Brief, but Entire Body of Christian Laws, tho' not put into the Form of a *System*.

This was the Sense of the Pious Writers and Primitive Doctors of the Christian Church: When we read the High *Encomiums* given to the Evangelical and Apostolick Writings, by *Cyprian, Eusebius, Theodoret, Basil, Nazianzen, Augustine, Jerom, Chrysostom, Sedulius, Prudentius*, and other great Lights of the Church, we can't question whether they were fully perswaded that those Sacred Books were a perfect Body of Divine Laws, tho' they are not artistically digested, nor put into a nice method. They were too starched and formal for the Divine Teachers: But here is that which is of a far more excellent nature. We are not put off with naked Ideas and bare Theories; but the Doctrines, Exhortations and Precepts of our Saviour and his Apostles are enlivened and invigorated by Realities; by actual Experiments, by the noblest Examples and Patterns, especially that most Perfect and Consolument one of our Blessed Lord himself. This is much more moving, affecting, and convincing, than the dry way of *Systems*.

And whereas, not only Mr. *Whiston*, but his Admirer Mr. *Lock*, think that they sufficiently disparage the *Apostolical Epistles* by saying they were *Occasional*, we are to know that this is part of their just commendation.

ation. For by these Occasions and Emergencies in the Christian Churches, the Virtue and Usefulness of the Apostles Rules and Laws are discovered, and their Efficacy is known and confirm'd by Tryal and Experience: which wonderfully brightens them, and sets them off, and renders them serviceable and practicable in all future Ages. Besides, it is the peculiar Excellency of these Writings, that they are not pen'd in an ordinary and common way. It is just and congruous, that the Inspired Writings should differ from those of other Men.

And yet they are not wholly different neither, for as well known, that the *Eastern* Penmen were wont to use a more *Lax* and *Unartificial* way of Writing (even, very few of the best Philosophers, whether *Natural* or *Moral*, of any *Sect* that I ever met with, educ'd their Opinions to fixed Models and Rules. I don't find that these Great Men, *Socrates*, *Plato*, *Pythagoras*, *Democritus*, *Zeno*, *Epicurus*, *Epictetus*, *Seneca*, *Cicero*, were *System-makers*. Yet Mr. *Whiston*, as if he were ignorant of this, finds fault with the Sacred Writers of the New Testament, because they did not tie themselves to a *Systematic* Way. It is a wonder that our *Mathematician* did not require *Lemmas*, *Proposals*, &c. in the Writings of the Apostles. He had, *Justin Martyr* would have answered him, The Books (saith he) of the Holy Scriptures were not made and drawn up in the way of *Demonstration*, as being above all *Demonstration*, and attesting the Truth by virtue of their being worthy of themselves to be believed. So likewise they are above *Systems*; and our unerring Guide and Instructor

(a) Οὐδὲ ἔτι ἀποβλέψας, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι τοῦ λόγου, ἀπὸ τοῦ
ἑαυτοῦ ἀποβλέψας, ἀλλὰ ἀξιοῦντας μάλιστα τὸ ἀλλοτρίον. Dia-
g cum Tryph.

22 *Reflections on Mr. Whiston's*

thought fit to leave with us the exact Standard of Divine Truth without them. Which disproves what Mr. Whiston confidently asserts, that unless we own the Book of the *Constitutions* to be Apostolical, we must suppose, that Christ left his Church unprovided in the principal Concern of all; that is, he gave it no Rule of Faith and Practice to walk by. This is an idle and groundless supposition, and hath no bottom but Mr. Whiston's wild Fancy; for I have shewed that the Writings of the New Testament are an accurate Rule of Belief and Practice, and that they are perfectly framed for the guidance of the Christian Church in all Ages; and in consequence of this, that there is no occasion at all for looking out for a *System* for this purpose.

I would here observe by the way, that he who talks against *Papery* in several Places of his Books, yet asserts and maintains the *Capital Taxes* of the Church of Rome, namely, that the Books of the Old and New Testament are not the Perfect Rule of our Faith and Manners; which may make us suspect that he hangs out *False Colours* when he pretends to attack the *Romanists*. He shews himself a Friend to them, whilst he would seem to be their Enemy.

But to return to the *Constitutions*, Mr. Whiston is very solicitous to maintain the Credit of this New Bible; for besides that he hath plentifully made use of *Turrianus* the Jesuit's *Prolegomena* before the *Constitutions*, to prove the Authority of them, he hath also shew'd a great deal of Reading and Learning of his own in this Undertaking. It must be acknowledged, that no Man ever offer'd so much before, and sometimes so plausibly on this head; yet all along he discovers that he is on the wrong side; and he himself freely owns, that many Places in the *Constitutions* are *Spurious*. But he saith he leaves those out in his Translation, and supplies them with

what

that is Genuine; but who hath taught him to discern between the one and the other; and must be the sole Judge in this matter? It appears that he is not exact in his Translation of the Greek, either in the main or the Constitutions (and is questioned by some whether his Abilities in that Language reach so far). He changes Words as he pleases, and most notoriously he puts *is* for *is* in the Doxologies. Now he translates and alters as he pleases, 'tis no wonder that he interprets the Sense as he thinks good, and makes it serve the *Author's* Design. Thus far we have seen what are the *Author's* he deals in, and how deceitfully but unsuccessfully he hath managed them.

IV. I observe again, how inconsistent and self-contradictory Mr. Whiston is in this his late Performance. He declares against Popery with some zeal, and often gives us the Title of *Antichristianism*; and yet he trumps up the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and *Recognitions*, and other Spurious Writings which are stuffed with Superstition, and commend to us the observation of several Ceremonies and Practices which favour of the Church of Rome, and which, by the by, shew that these Writings are not of that Antiquity which is pretended. The Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Book viii. sets it down as a Practice enjoined by the Apostles, that whenever the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is celebrated, there must be Two Deacons plac'd on both sides of the Altar, holding in their Hands a Fan made of thin Skins, or of the Feathers of Peacocks, or of Fine Cloth, with which they must beat away all little Flies, and hinder them from falling into the Cups. And in the same place the High Priest, that is, the Bishop, is commanded to make the sign of the Cross on his Forehead with his Hand, that so the troublesome and buzzing Animals may be effectually driven

run away either by the Fly-Trap, or by the Sign of the Cross, or by both. Such idle and ridiculous Things in Religion doth Mr. Whiston approve of and saith, that the Book which commands them is as Canonical as the Bible, yea, is the chief Part of the Bible.

In this Book, which he thus extols, *Traditions Reliques, Canonical Hours*, are much talk'd of. The one for the Dead is approv'd of as a necessary part of Christianity. The Prayer runs thus, (a) *that God Ever of Mankind, who hath received his Soul, will forgive him every Sin voluntary and involuntary.* The Eucharist is made a proper Oblation, and is offered both for the Quick and the Dead, which Mr. Whiston allows of in the following Words, (b) *In the Liturgy Part of the Constitutions, the Prayers are supposed effectual, on account of the Propitiatory Sacrifice, which the Bishop or Presbyter offer to and commend before God for the Quick and the Dead, in the Eucharist.* And afterwards he saith, *It is high time to introduce those Original, Pious, Authentic, and Apostolic Forms of Christian Sacrifice, Worship, and Devotion, that is, it is high time for us to be stark Papists.* In the Book of the Constitutions, the Elevation of the Host, and the consecrated Oyl at Baptism are commended to us: the Cause of Scripture is there assigned much after the Roman Fashion, and so is the Number of Ecclesiastical Orders. Norwithstanding this, Mr. Whiston with great assurance proclaims to the World, that the Book of Constitutions, which contains these things, is of Divine Authority; part of it (he saith) was delivered by our Saviour himself, and part was drawn up in a Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem, and written

(a) Book viii, Chap. 41.

(b) *Key to the 4th. Constitution. Chap. 1. p. 3.*

St. Clemen. So faith the Man that professes him-
self an Enemy to all Popery, and inveighs against
the Church of Rome, and hath foretold its Downfall
within Five Years at farthest: But where is his
Fidelity and self-consistency whilst he does this, and
yet Publicly defends these Writings which show of
the grossest Things in Popery? Surely this can't please
that sort of People which he designed to gratify by
his Writings: I'm mistaken if they be Friends to
the Roman Rite; and yet these are in his New Bi-
ble. I don't see what Party he can entirely oblige
his Friends and Disps.
Again, tho' he pretends to be a great Zealot
against Popish Idolatry, and particularly the Popish
worshipping the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament,
seeing these are but Creatures; yet he plainly favours
his practice, whilst he denies *Christ's Divinity*, and
tho' he is no more than a Creature, and yet holds it
lawful to worship him with Divine Worship: Is not
this downright Idolatry? If it be not, no Man can
charge the Heathens with that fault, and blame them
for paying Divine Adoration to mere Creatures.
We read, that the Gentiles are reminded by the
apostle of their former Heathen Worship, when
they did serve things which by nature are as Gods,
at 1. 8. which they could not have been blamed
for, if it had been lawful to worship those who are
not Gods but Gods by Nature, that is, Real and True
Gods: wherefore Mr. Whiston, and his Arian Bre-
thren can't clear themselves of Idolatrous Worship: I
think this is very intelligible and plain, and it fol-
lows undeniably from their worshipping of *Christ*, (as
Mr. Whiston professes to do) and yet their not al-
lowing him to be True God, but a Created Being.
I might mention Mr. Whiston's symbolizing with
the Pagan and Popish *Idolatry* in this likewise, that as

the *Pagan* worshipp'd One Supreme God, and with him other *Idols* and *Secondary* Ones: And as the Church of *Rome* pays Divine Worship to God, as likewise to Angels and Saints as his Representatives in Mr. *Whiston* preaches up Divine Adoration to be paid to God the Father, as the most High God, as also to the Son and Holy Ghost as *Lower* and *inferior Deities*, commission'd and appointed by the Supreme God. Thus Mr. *Whiston* can not possibly evade the imputation of *Idolatry*, not only *Pagan* but *Popish* *Idolatry*. What then shall we think of this Man? Does he talk and act as one that hath an utter dislike and abhorrence of the *Roman Church*? Is he not ready to be thought to be a Tool and Machine of the *Society*, whilst he remonstrates against them? May he own another Face, than that which he wears with *Antichristian* *Idolatry* which he denies Christ? And then, as for *Antichristianity*, he protests that he is a sworn Adversary to it, and he every where takes occasion to say in the Face of *Antichrist*, when then can he say to those Words of St. *John* Ep. 2. 22. 23. He is *Antichrist* that denies the Father and the Son, who denies the Son, the Father hath not the Father: for he that acknowledges the Son hath the Father also. Where as denying the Father is the same with denying him, as is evident from the foregoing Clause, where he call'd the denying of the Father. Now that this Text looks directly on Mr. *Whiston*, is in this Apostle's Days there were some of his persuasion, that is, some that had the confidence to deny the Divinity of the Second Person in the Trinity, and to assert that the First Person only is God. Against these false Teachers and Seducers the Apostle sets himself, and peremptorily declares, that the Second, as well as the First Person is God, and that those who deny the Divinity of the one, do likewise deny the Divinity of the other; for such

Essential Nature of the Godhead, that all the three Persons are Equally Divine: the Deity can't be separated from any of them; and therefore he that denies the Son, that is, the Divinity of the Son, denies the Father also; that is, denies him to be God. The Father and the Son being the same in Essence and Coeternal, it must needs follow, that whoever rejects the Divinity of the Son, rejects that of the Father: and by denying Christ to be the Son of the Father by Eternal Generation, he at the same time denies the Paternity itself. Now, if the Inspired Apostle may be believ'd, the Person that doth this deserves the Name of *Antichrist*, he is the direct Opposer of Christ as he is God. With what face then can Mr. Whiston read these words of St. Paul, and yet continue his Opposition to the Divinity of Christ? Ought he not to be ashamed and confounded when he reads what he hath lately publish'd, that (a) *Athanasian Doctrine is the first Branch of Antichristianism*? And in another place he saith, the *Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, has Antichristianism for its Mother*. Blush, blush, O Vile Man, never more boast of your Zeal against Antichrist. Read what that Renowned Saint (whom you have so vilified and traduced) prophesied of *Arian*, namely: that he was the *Father of Antichrist*; and he had not believ'd him if he had said he was a Part of him.

V. I will here take notice of another thing, wherein Mr. Whiston contradicts himself, and gives a little proof of his Sincerity. He declares more

(a) Historical Preface, p. 8.

(b) Athanas. Orat. 2. cont. Arianos.

than once that he is a Socinian; no, by no means, and he gives these People very bad words: but notwithstanding this, he falls in and closes with all the Writers of that Party, and upholds their Opinions. The main Doctrines of Socinianism are the denying Christ's Divinity, and the disowning his Satisfaction: the former he confesses in express terms to be his Persuasion, yea, he greedily licks up Socinus's Doctrine who saith, that (a) the true Doctrine about God till the time of the Nicene Council, as appears from the Writings of all that were then extant, that is, the Father was believ'd to be the only True God: but afterwards the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence, the Doctrine which the Antichristian Church defends. This is the very Dialect of Mr. Whiston.

Again, he is justly interpreted to deny the Satisfaction of our Saviour, in as much as he hath not one word, in his several Articles, (he calls them) that so much as intimates this Doctrine, or any thing like it.

And as for the other Branches of Socinianism, he openly and plainly avows them in his late Writings, as that there are Errors in the Copies of the Bible, and some Books have not sufficient Authority; that men's Souls after Death are Immortal, and that the Torments of the Wicked in Hell shall cease; that a Creature may be the Object of Adoration; that Christ ascended to Heaven more than once. These and some others, which are Characteristic Marks and Badges of a Socinian, are found upon Mr. Whiston; and yet he is not ashamed to say he is no Socinian, and that he disapproves of their Doctrines, and can't possibly agree with them. This is not one Grain of Truth or Honesty in this, which

(a) Socin, Epist. 2. ad Rodec.

as ill a thing as can be said of any Writer. No belief is to be given to one that is thus Inconsistent with himself.

VL But I dismiss this Reflection, to hasten to another, wherein I shall take notice how *Partial* and *Arbitrary* Mr. *Whiston* hath been in his Quotations, he not only confidently thrusts upon us the Spurious Writings of *Hermas*, *Barnabas*, *Clement's Confessions* and *Recognitions*, with the *Apostolical Canons* falsely call'd (of which I spoke before): which is as if he should chuse to have Knights of the Post to give Evidence and Witness rather than True and Honest Men, whose Reputation is untainted: but he also calls upon us the Sayings of *Tatian*, *Athenagoras*, *Dionysius Antiochenus*, *Irenaeus*, of *Origen*, *Justin Martyr*, &c. And why, I pray, of these rather than of those that succeeded them, *viz.* those Learned and Tried Pillars of the Christian Church, *Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, *Jerom*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustus*, *Optatus Milevitans*, *Basil*, *Gregory Nyssen* and *Naxianzen*, *Innocentius Livinensis*, *Cyril of Alexandria*, *Isidore of Pella*, &c. And why must not the Fathers of the *Niceane Council* itself be heard? Is not the determination of above three hundred Persons chosen out of all Parts of the Christian World, and fam'd for their Learning and Piety, more considerable and valuable than the Sentiments of a few Novices in Christianity, in whose Writings are found many things alien from the Orthodox Faith? Mr. *Whiston* can give no other Reason of his preferring these to the other, than his Judging their Authority by his own Prejudices and Prepossessions: he thinks they speak on his side, and therefore he concludes them to be Authentic, and in a manner Infallible.

Again,

Again, he doth not act like an *Impartial* and *Sincere* Man, in that he omits several Passages in the very *Ante-Nicene* Writers, which are expressly opposite to the *Arian* Doctrine. To this purpose I intend to have set before the Reader sundry Passages collected out of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Origen*, *Hippolytus*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, wherein the same Doctrine is asserted that afterward was confirm'd by the *Nicene Council*: But when I consulted (a) *Bishop Meibomius*, I found that this was done to my hand: and (b) *Meibomius*, before him, had produced plenty of Testimonies out of those Writings for establishing the Doctrine of the Trinity, and to prove thence that the *Ante-Nicene* Writers were Sincere Asserters of the Article. I will only present the Reader with my Own Collections which I have made out of the two *Principal Writers* which Mr. Whiston boasts of, on whom he chiefly builds his denial of *Christ's Divinity*, namely the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and *Ignatius* in his *Epistles*. I will fairly and sincerely lay some of the plain Words of these Writers before the Reader, and then appeal to him whether they do not assert the Received Doctrine of the Trinity, and more especially of the *Divinity* of the *Second Person*.

I begin with the *Constitutions*, and I have set down the places according to the Sections and Chapters in Mr. Whiston's Book. *Τίς δὲ ἀποστολὴ ἐστὶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν· ἵνα γὰρ πρὸς ἀπορίας μελετήσῃς καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνην διδάσῃς τὸ Θεῷ συνέχειν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀποστολὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* In all things please Christ, who is our GOD, for if any Man follows after unrighteousness, and do those things that are contrary to GOD's Will, such a

(a) *Defens. fidel. Nicæne.*

(b) *Dogm. Theolog. Tom. 2. de Trinitate.*

Notes on Jesus Christ our Lord, and the most Holy Spirit.
 Book VI. Sect. 24. Chap. 24. H. Observe
 that God the Father is the only One God, and he
 is to be worship'd; and yet is said that the Son
 and the Holy Ghost are to be worship'd: whence it
 manifest, that at the Second and Third Person in
 Trinity are to be worship'd, tho' the First of them
 is to be worship'd alone: so the Second and Third
 Persons are GOD, tho' the First is declar'd to be
 Only One God. This, I conceive, will give light
 to John 3. That they may know who the Only True
 God is: Jesus Christ whom man hath sent: where the
plur only is to be applied to Jesus Christ as well as
 God the Father, and accordingly the one is the
 True God no less than the other. That this Inter-
 pretation which I offer may not seem strange, I
 explain and confirm it by 1 Cor. 9. 6. Or I only
 Banquet, have not my power, &c. In which place
 only doth not exclude Brother, but takes him in
 Paul, as I believe every one that reads the words
 freely grant. The same is to be acknowledg'd
 that forecited Text, *plur* only comprehends God
 Father and the Son, and they are both of them
 Only True God, and equally to be Worship'd. Which
 I suppose, is the true meaning of the words which
 are quoted out of the Confession: *God sent Christ upon Earth*
as a Man, being GOD, the Word and Man. Book
 VII. Sect. 62. chap. 26. Where again God and Man
 are contra-distinguish'd from one another, that we
 may gather thence, that whenever in these Writings
 Christ is call'd God, the True, Living, and most Holy
 God is meant, and that that Title is not to be un-
 derstood as sometimes it is in Scripture, namely
 signify a Superior, a King, a Magistrate; who, tho'
 he hath the Appellation of God given to him, yet
 but a Man.

(a) Hist. Eccles. lib. 3.

I conclude then, that tho' there is a deal of *Pagan* and *Jewish* Stuff, and impertinent things in the *Constitutions*, and many false and counterfeit, and several Expressions that are far below the Dignity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God, who is God himself; yet there are passages enow whence we may rationally gather, that the Author of these Books believ'd the Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity, and particularly of the Divinity of the Second Person in it: or at least, those words which I have produced may fairly be construed that way; and it is probable that Mr. *Whiston* hath wilfully misrepresented and distorted the meaning of these and other places, that he may make the Author an *Arian*, because he is one himself.

Next, I come to give the Reader a Specimen of the Doctrine about the *Holy Trinity*, which we meet with in the *Epistles* that go under *Ignatius's* Name, and shew from several plain Passages in these *Epistles*, that the Writer was Orthodox as to that Point, and more especially as to the Divinity of our Lord. At all, a Man can't think that he was a declar'd Enemy to this Doctrine, as Mr. *Whiston* would make us believe. My Citations out of *Ignatius's* Larger *Epistle*, (for these are they that Mr. *Whiston* is pleas'd to approve of as Genuine, and therefore I will quote none but these) are such as the following.

Epistle to the Ephesians. *Εξ ους ἡν ὁ υἱος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὁ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ὄντων ἀρχαίων ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός.* We have a Physician, our Lord GOD Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son, and Word before the World began, the Deity and Eternity of the Son of God are asserted, for *ὁ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ὄντων ἀρχαίων* and *ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντων* are Expressions used in the Sacred Writings to signify Eternity, 8 Prov. 23. 2 Cor. 2. 7. the same with *ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντων*, 2 Tim. 1. 9. parallel with *ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὄντων*,
D 2 from

36 Reflections on Mr. Whiston's

from everlasting, 90 Psal. 2, 93.2. So that from this first Quotation it appears, that the Writer of the Epistle held that the $\text{A}\gamma\theta$ is Coeternal with the Father, which is the main part of the Nicene Symbol.

$\text{O}\ \text{K}\epsilon\iota\theta$ $\text{i}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\text{O}\iota\delta$ $\text{i}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\iota$, our Lord and GOD Jesus Christ: which being frequently used, must signify the True and Proper Deity.

Speaking of the wonderful Change that was made in the World upon the Incarnation of Christ, he saith, $\text{O}\iota\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\theta\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\theta\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\text{O}\iota\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\text{I}\theta$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\text{i}\tau\eta$ η $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\text{N}\epsilon\chi\alpha$, $\text{i}\tau\eta$ η $\text{N}\epsilon\chi\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\Psi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ η $\text{i}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\alpha$, η N $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$. GOD appear'd as a Man, and Man wonderfully operated as a GOD: but neither was the former a mere Opinion, nor was the second a dispensation: but the one was a Truth and Reality, and the other was a Dispensation fit for that time. Here 'tis to be remark'd (as was before on the like occasion) that the word GOD is to be understood in the most proper and strict Sense, because it is contra-distinguished from Man; and therefore when Ignatius asserts the Divinity of Christ (which he frequently doth) it must be taken concerning his Divinity, as applicable to the True Supreme God.

$\text{i}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\iota$, i $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\eta\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\tau\alpha\iota$, Jesus Christ who is Blessed for ever: the same with 9 Rom. 5. which Mr. Whiston saith is spoken concerning God the Father, and confidently tells us, that this Epithet is (a) always appropriated to the Father, and he appeals to all Antiquity. Which shews how well he is skill'd in Antiquity; for here we see that the Blessed for ever is attributed to the Son, and so it is in the Constitution, where there are these words, Ei $\text{i}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\alpha$ η $\text{i}\mu\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\alpha$, There is one Jesus Christ who is blessed

Primitive Christianity Reviv'd. 37

for ever. Book VIII. chap. 12. Thus he is confuted out of his own Beloved Authors, whom he reckons as *Antient and Primitive*.

Epistle to the *Magnesians*. The Clergy are intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ, *ὁ ἀπὸ αἰῶνος παρὰ Πατρί γεννητός. ὁ ὡς ὁ λόγος, ὁ γεννητός ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ λόγου, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ χρόνου, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ αἰῶνος, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ χρόνου, ὁ ἀρχὴ τοῦ αἰῶνος.* being begotten by the Father before the World began, was GOD the Word, the only begotten Son. See what was said before of *ὁ ἀπὸ αἰῶνος*.

It is said of God the Father, *Ὁ παντρώπος ἰαυτὸν δὴ καὶ Χριστὸν, τὸ ὡς αὐτὸν, ὡς ἰστὶν αὐτὸν ὁ λόγος, ὁ ἰσότης, ἀλλ' ἰσότης ὁ γὰρ ἰστὶ λαλῶν ἐσάρθυ σῶντα, ἀλλ' ἐσάρθυ ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνις ἰσότητος.* Who manifested himself by Jesus Christ, his Son, who is his Word, not a Verbal, but a Substantial Word; for he is not the Voice of Articulate Speech, but a Substance begotten by the Divine Power. Could we desire more Emphatical Expressions to set forth the real Divinity of the Second Person, communicated to him from the Essence or Substance of his Father, whereby he became *Consubstantial* with him?

Epistle to the *Romans*. *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς μῶν, Χριστὸς ὁ Θεός.* Jesus Christ our GOD. — *Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς μῶν, Χριστὸς ὁ Θεός.* Christ our GOD: and so again in the same Epistle, the very language of the Apostle *Thomas*, 20 John 28.

Epistle to the *Philadelphians*. *Εἰς ἀγέννητον ὁ Θεὸς καὶ υἱὸς, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμογενὴς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁμογενὴς ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἀνθρώπος, καὶ ὁμογενὴς τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ ἀληθοῦς.* There is one unbegotten, God the Father: there is one only begotten Son, GOD the Word and Man: and there is one Comforter the Spirit of Truth. Here is a most pregnant Testimony concerning the Divinity of Christ, for the Father is call'd God, and so is the Son: if you question the Divinity of the Son, you may as reasonably question the Divinity of the Father. And because there is but One Divinity, therefore we undeniably infer, and affirm that the Father and the Son are One GOD. And moreover, 'tis attested here that Christ

28 *Reflections on Mr. Whiston's*

is both God and Man, which necessarily implies that he is as really and truly God; as he is Man. And seeing the Title of God is apply'd not once or twice only, but constantly to the Second Person in the Trinity, both in these *Epistles of Ignatius*, and in the *Constitutions*, it would be intolerable Folly and Sacrilege to say, that God in these Writings doth not signify in the most proper Sense, the Eternal, Infinite and Supreme Deity, when 'tis attributed to the Son.

Epistle to Polycarp. Εὐχόμεθα ὑμῖν διὰ πάντων ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, I wish you all happiness in our GOD Jesus Christ.

Epistle to the Church of Tarsus. Ἰνὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦ καὶ Θεὸν πατέρα μου, that I may see Christ my Saviour and my GOD. This frequent and constant applying the word GOD to Christ, puts out of all doubt that it is properly and strictly used.

After he had been proving from several Topics that Christ was not a Mere Man, he concludes, Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Θεὸς ὁ λόγος; How could such a one be a mere Man, and not GOD the Word? And then he adds to confirm it, 1 John 1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He must certainly be an Obstinate and Hardned Wretch that doth not see and confess the Proper Divinity of the Son of God attested by all this.

Epistle to the Antiochians. He exhorts them, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος θεὸς παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, to cast off all Error whether Jewish or Heathenish, and neither to introduce a multitude of Gods, nor so deny Christ under the pretence of holding One God. This is a most express and signal Attestation of Christ's Divinity, and directly strikes at Mr. Whiston's Heretical Position,

on, that God the Father is the only One God, and therefore the Son is not God; whereas we are told here that we ought not to understand the Doctrine of One God, so as to take occasion thence to deny Christ, that is, to deny Christ to be God. And that the Unity of the Godhead doth not exclude the Divinity of Christ, he proceeds to shew in the following Words, "For Moses, the faithful Servant of God, when he said, *The Lord thy God is One Lord*, and consequently preach'd that there is only One God, yet did confess our Lord to be God, when he said, *The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord*, Gen. 19. 24. (meaning by the Lord or Jehovah in the beginning of this Verse God the Father, and by that Name in the end of the Verse God the Son). And again, God said, *Let us make Man in our Image*, 1 Gen. 26. The Prophets also, when they say in the Person of God concerning the Father of the Universe, *I am the First and I am the Last, and besides me there is no God*, 44. Is. 6. They do also speak of our Lord Jesus Christ, as in 9. Isa. 6. *Unto us a Son is given, and his Name shall be call'd the Mighty God*; and 7. Isa. 14. *They shall call his Name Emmanuel*. The Evangelists also, when they said the Father is the only True God, 17 John 3. did not omit the Doctrine concerning our Lord, but wrote thus, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*, 1 John 1.

All this is said by Ignatius, or whoever was the Author of these Epistles, to prove that God the Son is equally God with the Father. And he concludes thus, *Πᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἓν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀληθινή τις, ὁ ἀναρχὸς καὶ ἀκαταρακτός, ὁ ἀόρατος, ὁ ἀφύπνους, ὁ ἀβυσσὸς, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς, ὁ ἀκαταμάχητος.* Therefore, whosoever preaches that there is but One God alone, in such manner as to take away Christ's Divinity, he is a Devil, and the Enemy of all righteousness. This plain

plain downright Language shews, that the Writer of this Epistle was in good earnest, and verily believ'd what he said. I wish our *Arian* Infidels would read this Passage, and more particularly I advise Mr. *Whiston* (who hath so high an esteem for these Writings) to ponder it well, and let the World see the good Effects of it. Indeed I am amaz'd that he could peruse this part of the Epistle which I have produced, and yet maintain that impious Doctrine which opposes it.

I don't deny, that there are some Places in the other Epistles that convey to us very odd Apprehensions concerning the Persons in the Trinity, and I look upon them as spurious Interpolations, and dangerous Corruptions of the Text; and therefore Mr. *Whiston* hath done great disservice to our Holy Religion, by telling the World, that even these very Writings are of Divine Authority; but yet I don't leave to say thus much, that it is likely, that several of those Passages which Mr. *Whiston* quotes out of *Ignatius* in behalf of his *Arianism*, may by a candid Construction be understood in favour of the Orthodox Faith.

To give only One Instance, supposing those Words in the Epistle to the Church of *Tarsus* not to be interpolated, but to be Genuine, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς*, He (that is, Christ) is not God as the Father over all. Supposing, I say, these Words to be Genuine, I don't see but that they may be taken in a very safe sense, for 'tis plain that *Ignatius* here speaks in opposition to those Heretical Seducers of his Days, who held that Christ is God over all, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς*, as being both Father and Son, for he explains it, and represents them speaking thus in the beginning of this Epistle. And these very Hereticks are spoken of in the *Constitutions*, who supposed (or supposed) that Jesus was God over all, thinking

to be the Father of himself, suspect him to be both Son and the Comforter; Book 6. cap. 26. This was their Heresy, and thence we learn how to understand that foresaid Passage in Ignatius, and to give an account of it suitable to our present purpose.

But before I do that, let me give the Reader the foregoing Words of the *Constitutions* in the Original, which are these, *Αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ ὁ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον*, the middle Clause of which is thus English'd by Mr. Whiston [*and glorifying him as his own Father*] where he grossly mistakes the meaning of the Verb *Ἀγαπᾷ*, which in this place doth not signify *caricare*, but *opinari* or *existimare*. If he had consulted Photius's *Nomocanon*, or Balsamon and Zonaras on the Canons, he might have found that this acception of the Word is frequent with them. And thus indeed is the primary and proper rendering of the Word, as we may see in all good Authors: and besides, in this place it is join'd with *δοξάζει*, and of the like signification with it, which easily directs us to the true Translation of the Word. Notwithstanding this, neither Mr. Whiston nor his Learn'd friend took notice of the Genuine Import of this Word, but understood it contrary to the meaning of the place, and to the acception of the Word among the best Greek Authors. But this by the by.

I proceed now to shew what the Hereticks of those times meant when they said that Christ was *God over all*; 'tis evident that they understood it not in the Apostles sense, Rom. 9. 5, but they held that there was no difference between Christ and God the Father: They confounded the Persons of the Trinity, and held that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost was one and the same Person. Of these Men Ignatius speaks in his Epistle to the *Trallians*,

liant, representing them to say thus, *miris deus* and
g. vnde g. vnde dicitur, The Father, the Son and the Holy
 Ghost are one and the same; and he mentions this
 again in his Epistles to the Philippians. Now, he
 endeavours to refute this Erroneous Perswasion, by
 shewing that the Persons in the Trinity are real-
 ly different, and particularly that the Father is not the
 Son, nor the Son the Father, and that the Father is
 ever all in this respect only, that he is the Fount-
 ain and Origine of the Deity, and in that sense superi-
 or to the Son, and may be said to be ever *ex aeterno* his
 See this explained in the following Words, in the
 Epistle to the Thessalians, which will confirm what
 we have said: He confutes the Hereticks, by alledging
 1 Cor. xv. 28. *When all things shall be subdued unto him,*
then shall the Son also himself be subjected unto him,
and he shall put all things under him: wherefore saith Ignatius, *one*
trinitas est personarum, et in unitate in unitate, vnde dicitur
He is one Person who puts all Things under, and is all in all
and he is another under whom all things are put. From
 whence 'tis plain, that the Erroneous Assertion which
 Ignatius struck at was this, That there was no dif-
 ference between the Father and the Son: But the
 same Being was both Father and Son.
 Now, what is this to Mr. Whiston's purpose?
 What becomes of the wonderful discovery which he
 pretended to make from that Passage of Ignatius
Christ is not the God and Father over all? He only let
 us see how ignorant he was of the Intent and Mean-
 ing of this Writer, and how ready he is to catch at
 any thing that he fancies makes for his wild Opin-
 ion, tho' really it doth not. This may caution
 for the future never to trust to his Interpretation of
 any of the Authors he quotes. He deals not fairly
 and honestly with them or us, and forgets to com-
 pare one place of a Writer with another. If he
 would have done so with Ignatius's Epistles, he might
 have

re found Passages enow that would have clear'd
 Writer.

VII, Let us further see the *Partiality* and *Arbitrary*
 of our New *Arian*. Tho' he appeals to the
 others who were before the *Nicene Council*, yet he
 is off *Clement* of *Alexandria* and *Tertullian*, who
 wrote in the Second Century, or at the beginning
 of the Third, and consequently were before that
 Council. The former of these Writers, *Clement*, the
 Learned and Pious Presbyter of *Alexandria*, one of
 the most considerable Persons in those early Times,
 rejected because he hath so many express Passages
 concerning the Divinity of the Son, making him
 equal with the Father, and One with him: for this
 reason he is laid aside, and his Testimony will
 not be admitted; though another reason is pretend-
 ed, but very falsely, as *Gemianus*, *Herodotus*, *Du Pin*,
 and others have sufficiently prov'd. The latter,
 namely *Tertullian*, is not acceptable to Mr. *Whiston*,
 tho' he was a Learned Champion for the Christian
 Religion against the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and defend-
 ed the Catholic Truth against *Marcion*, and *Valenti-*
nus, and other Heretics; so excellent a Writer, that
Cyprian owned him to be his *Master*, and profes-
 sed he pass'd not One Day without reading some
 portion of his Writings. Notwithstanding this, he
 is discarded, on no other account without doubt
 than this, that he several times expressly asserts, that
 the Word is of the same Substance with the Father,
 and that the Father and He are One, in his *Apology*
 against the *Gentiles*. He hath a whole Book of the
 Trinity, where he makes it his chief business to prove
 that Christ is the True God, and begotten of his Father
 from Eternity. In his Book against *Praxeas* he purpose-
 ly and designedly asserts and maintains this Doctrine

of the Trinity, he in exprels Terms affirms, there are Three Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, and that these Persons are of the same substance. And if it could be prov'd that he wrote this Book when he was a *Montanist*, yet this doth not the least invalidate his Testimony, because his Opinions had no affinity with this matter, as we see in those Books which he wrote in favour of *Montanists*. And tho' 'tis true, that *Tertullian* and *Clemens of Alexandria*, do sometimes make use of Words and Terms, that may seem in some measure to derogate from the Dignity of the Second Person in the Trinity, yet if we weigh them and compare them with other Expressions by them concerning the Second Person, we shall not be backward to own, that they signify the same that is now held by the Christian Church, and the Doctrine of *Consubstantiality* declar'd at *Nice*. This may suffice to shew the Arbitrary way of Quotation used by Mr. *Whiston*. When he pleases, he makes use of the Authority of the Ancient Writers, and when he thinks fit, he cries out of Interpretations and Corruptions.

VIII. Moreover, I will observe concerning his use of the *Fathers* which he quotes and relies upon, that they are ill-chosen Witnesses to the Doctrine he maintains, and produces them for. Tho' *Origen*, who is a Great Man with him, hath many excellent Things in his Writings, yet the number of his Errors exceeds them. He is Mystical and Allegorical when he should be plain, and so *vice versa*; He holds that the Sun and Moon, and all the Heavenly Bodies are Living Creatures, and are endued with Rational Souls; that the World was from Eternity; that Human Souls pre-existed, and sinn'd before they

into Bodies ; that there is a constant Trans-
 formation of them ; that God hath Parts and Mem-
 bers like a Man ; that neither the Rewards of the
 righteous, nor the Punishments of the Wicked in
 Future State shall be Eternal ; that evil Demons
 at last be saved. It is true, *Eusebius* and *Ruffinus*
 logiz'd for *Origen*, but the generality of the Fa-
 thers voted against him, and especially *Basil* and *Epi-
 phanius*, the latter of whom thrust him into the black
 catalogue of Heretics ; and in the Fifth General
 Council He and his Writings were Anathematized.
 It is no wonder therefore, that this *Latitudinarian Fa-
 ther* (as Bishop *Bull* calls him) had some odd Noti-
 ons concerning the *Trinity*, different from those that
 the Fathers afterwards had, as (a) *Petavius* and (b)
Photius have proved from abundant Instances out of
Origen's Books. And yet if we would be Candid
 and Impartial, we might put a good Construction
 on some Expressions, which at the first hearing of
 them seem to be Heterodox ; And we may find in
 the Author's 1st. Book of Principles, chap. 2, clear
 Testimonies to the Doctrine of the Trinity ; he there
 asserts the *Eternal Generation of the Word*, and proves
 from 8 Prov. 22, &c. 1 Col. 15. 1 Heb. 2, yet the
 learned (c) Patriarch of *Constantinople* thought he
 had reason to charge some other Parts of this Book
 with absurd, impious and blasphemous Doctrines. But
 I confess I can't but stand wondering at the strange
 verdict of that Learned Writer, who tells us that
*Origen doth not recede a Nail's Breadth from the Ca-
 tholic Faith*. One would be almost inclin'd to think
 that he never read that Author.

(a) De Trinitat. lib. cap.

(b) Origeniana. lib. cap.

(c) Photius in Bibliothecâ.

(d) Bull. Defens. fid. Nic. Sect. 2. cap. 9.

Benetus is another Father in great esteem with *Whiston*, and often quoted by him; but tho' some Accounts he is an excellent Author, and of very good use, yet he was a Careless and Rash Writer, and hath great Numbers of Mistakes, some of them very gross, as hath been observ'd by the Learned, and therefore Mr. *Whiston* made a bad choice when he took *Benetus* to witness for him, especially in the great Point we are speaking of.

Lactantius, *Arnobius*, *Minutius Felix*, wrote their Books before they were well acquainted with the Principles of the Christian Religion, and had arriv'd to any considerable skill in the Scriptures, so it could not be expected they should be so sound in the Articles which relate to the Trinity. Especially *Lactantius* was no fit Author to quote on this Subject, for he is mistaken in almost all the Articles of Christianity which he speaks of; either he had not studied them, or he misunderstood them, and he mix'd his own Fancies and Dreams with the matters of Religion. Wherefore it is a strange and prodigious Thing, that Men of Learning and good Sense should argue from such Writings that are no Authority in these great Points, and yet blush and make a noise with them, as if they could err.

IX. But I shall speak yet more generally and *comprehensively*, on occasion of Mr. *Whiston's* quoting the Fathers, and observe that he takes not the best way to establish his Opinion; for the Writings of the Fathers both before and after the *Nicene Council* are no authentic Standard of Truth. I would not be mistaken here, for no Man can pay a juster Reverence to the Fathers than I do, and I own the Use and even the Necessity of being acquainted with them.

yet I have reason to assert that they are not to
look'd upon by us as Authentic Guides to Di-
vine Truth. None can withstand this Proposition, who con-
fess that these Writers dissent from themselves, and
from one another; that they generally are Obscure,
and seem to Affect to be so. There is no Arguing
in their Words, for they frequently speak with-
out Caution and Deliberation; and much of what
they say is by the By. Even *Ambrose's* Taste was
not always Exact, he hath very poor and frigid Ar-
guments sometimes; and very sorry Answers he
gives to some Objections. Indeed he heaps up ma-
ny of them, thinking to overwhelm his Adversary,
but he doth not always take care to have Weight
as well as Number. However, 'tis a foolish Practice
to impose upon the World by alledging some small
Quotations and Scraps out of the Fathers, giving no heed
to the Scope and Intent, or the Coherence of the
Words. And the *Antiquities* the Fathers are, the less
they to be depended upon, for these generally
came out of the Schools of the Philosophers, and
brought their Corrupt Notions with them. Bishop
Worship observes, that (a) after the Platonic Doctrine was
introduc'd into the Church, the Writers of the second and
third Age were not wont very simply and plainly to confess
Christ to be God.

Indeed, we can't name one of the Fathers that is
not tainted with some false Notion in Religion.
Those that were before *Constantine* the Great, ming-
led it with those Erroneous Principles which had
been imbibed from the Sects they had been of: and
those after *Constantine* do generally more or less fa-
vour some Doctrines which savour of Superstition,

(a) Vindic. Ignat. Epist. part 1. cap. 1.

and Innovation. Besides, the Writings of the ancient Fathers fell into the hands of such Men as fully corrupted them, both by adding to them, and taking from them, and that either out of Ignorance and Negligence, or from Design and Malice. The Complaint was made by *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, *Rufinus*, *Vincentius Lirinensis* of old, and afterwards by (a) *Isidorus Senensis*, (b) *Ludovicus Vivus*, *Erasmus*, *Blasius*.

As for the Controversy that is before us, the Fathers generally had not studied it: they did not understand the Terms they made use of, or at least they us'd them sometimes in one sense, and sometimes in another. They had not fix'd the meaning of those common Words which were us'd in explaining the Trinity. The Philosophers us'd *Substantia* and *Personae* for the same thing, that is, for a *Substance*; and accordingly the Greek Fathers brought this Sense of the words into the Church, and applied them to the Persons of the Trinity. In the middle of the Fourth Century the Council of *Sardica* (as (c) *Theodoret* tells us) determin'd it Holy Ghost say that there are three *Hypostases* in the Trinity, because by *Hypostasis* they meant *Substance*. Even *Arianus* himself, and other Orthodox Fathers, at first confounded *Substance* and *Personae*: His Words are these in his Epistle to the Antiochians, *Μία Ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Υἱὸς ὁμοούσιος τῷ Θεῷ*; We say there but One *Hypostasis*, thinking it to be the same thing to mention *Hypostasis* or *Substance*. But afterwards they distinguish'd between them, and meant by the *Nature* or *Essence* of a Thing or Person common

(a) *Bibl. Sancta*. lib. 5.

(b) In *Augustin. de Civ. Dei*, lib. 22.

(c) *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4. cap. 25. § 1.

to more Things or Persons; but *Person* was Proper to an *Individuum* or Single Person. And this became the General and Receiv'd Acception of these Words among all the Writers of the *Greek Church*: they did not promiscuously use them, but distinguish'd between them, and applied the former to the Divinity common to the Three Persons, and the latter to the Persons singly. So the *Latin Fathers* at first took *Hypostasis* for *Substance*, and accordingly did there was but One *Hypostasis* in the Trinity; but afterwards they express'd themselves otherwise, and instead of the *Greek idea*, used *essentia* or *natura*, and for *persons*, and explain'd themselves accordingly in their treating on the Doctrine of the Trinity.

If the Reader would be further satisfied about this different Acception and Use of the foresaid Terms among the *Greek* and *Latin Fathers*, let him consult *Augustinus de Trinitate*, Lib. IV. Cap. 1, &c. and Bishop Bull, in his *Defens. Fid. Nic.* Cap. 9. Sect. 2. whence it will be seen what was the Occasion of the Disagreement of the Ancient Writers about the Doctrine of the Trinity. It was this: They had not settled and determin'd at first the Sense of the Terms used by them; and so some of them often-times meant the same thing, even when they seem'd to contradict one another. And I remember, *Augustinus*, in his *Epistle* to the *African Bishops*, lets us know that the Fathers on both Sides in the Council, appeal'd to the Writers of the preceding Ages, as Patrons of their respective Opinions: Which could not otherwise be; because there was not a perfect Agreement about the Terms they used. Once it was a Heresy to say, There are Three *Hypostases* in the Trinity; but at another time, it was proclaim'd Heresy to say the contrary.

50 *Reflections on Mr. Whiston's*

Bishop Bull more than once stands still and astonish'd at the Sayings of the Fathers: He is forc'd to stop in his Career of the *Anti-Nicene Writers Difficulties and Stones of Stumbling* (as he confesses) *lie in his way*; and he is almost ready to go back, to avoid them. He confesses that (a) *almost all the Fathers that were before the Nicene Council, in the manner of Explaining the Article of the Trinity, sometimes speak otherwise than the Catholics are wont to do at this day.* Thus, according to this Learned Man's Judgment, 'tis not possible to determine this (or indeed any) Point of Faith, and tell what is Orthodox, from the Writings of the Fathers, tho' he undertook the quite contrary Task: And so we see that this Learned Prelate might have spared all his Labour. This only Truth we gain, That the Testimony of the Fathers is not to be relied upon.

X. It is to be remark'd further, That as the *Fathers* Manner of Expressing themselves is generally such, that we can't make any certain Judgment concerning their real Perswasion, and consequently can't make it a Foundation for our Belief; so 'tis no unusual thing with those who quote the *Fathers*, to misinterpret them, and wretchedly misapply them, and make them speak as they please. They violently press them into their Service, and make them fight for them, whether they will or no.

The *Roman* Doctors are notorious for this, and more especially their Great Champion *Bellarmin*. They wind and turn the *Fathers* at their Pleasure. *Petavius* is remarkable on this Account, who (as)

(a) Def. Fid. Nic. Sect 2. Cap 9.

shew'd before) quotes several Passages out of the
Antient Fathers for the Orthodox Doctrine of
the Trinity; and yet afterwards (*De Trinitate*,
L. Cap. 3, 4, 5.) he shews that those very
Persons had not Right Apprehensions concerning
the Doctrine: Yea, he saith, some of them sav'd
Arian Heresy in Impiety and Absurdity. To must be
wond, that this Writer was well skill'd in the Greek
and Latin Fathers; but no Man abuses that Skill
more, for he uses the Testimony of those Ancients
at his pleasure.

Some among our selves are obnoxious on this
score, as Mr. *Flaminius* and Mr. *Dodwell*; (as I have
shew'd on another Occasion) Persons conversant
with the Monuments of the Ancients, but they seem
to account it no Fault to pervert their Meaning.
Mr. *Bishop Bull* and Mr. *Whiston* labour hard to
maintain the Credit and Authority of *Hermas*, *Ba-
silides*, *Ignatius*, and the rest of the Antient Wri-
ters; but in a far different way, and to contrary
ends; the one to confirm the Doctrine of the
Council of *Nice* about the Trinity, the other to
reprove and censure it; but neither of them with
any Satisfaction to an Impartial Reader; for both
of them seem to me to force their way, to strain
the Sense of those Authors, as if they had resolv'd
before-hand to make them speak in Favour of their
contrary Opinions.

Dr. *Grabe*, in his *Annotata*, shews himself too for-
ward to imitate *Bishop Bull*; and brings in what
he pleases out of the Antient Writers, to vouch
for what the Bishop had said. I could mention Va-
rious Passages out of those Authors on which
Learned Bishop hath shew'd his Skill and Art,
I will trouble the Reader with one only. *Ter-
tullian* is alledg'd by him to have said, *Falsse tem-
quando Filius Dei non esset*; which any Reader

would conclude is opposite to the Doctrine of the Son's Eternity: Yet see how the Bishop brings him off, and makes him Orthodox, *Defens. Fid. N. Sect. 3. Cap. 19.* but with the Loss of his Integrity; for, *bona fide*, & *ex animo*, are the Bishop's Words: That is, To represent this Father Catholic, he robs him of his Ingenuity and Sincerity: He saith, *He talks like a Heretic, but then with the Catholics.* Thus this Worthy Writer has a great, but unhappy Knack of Evasion. And in the other Parts of that Undertaking, where he attempts to prove that those Words in the Fathers which to us seem to have but little Affinity with the Nicene Doctrines, yet are to be understood in that Sense; he gives us a Cast of the same Talent.

Just after the same manner that he misinterprets the Sense of some of the Fathers, he also turns some of the Articles of the Church of England that is, he gives them a wrong Turn. When our Church expressly asserts the Doctrine of (a) Justification by Faith alone; and saith, *It is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort, &c.* this Reverend Writer hath penn'd above a Hundred Pages against it, and takes a great deal of Pains to bring in some Fathers to patronize his Opinion: But we can't expect he should deal fairly with them when he treats the Penmen of the Holy Scripture so oddly; for he saith, (b) That Justification by Faith is taught by no Inspired Writers, but Paul only. As much as to say, He is but one Single Writer

(a) Article the 11th.

(b) Examen Censuræ.

and what is he in Comparison with all the other apostolical Writers, who dissent from him?

Here, on this Occasion, I might observe to the reader, that some Men have no good Opinion of Paul; many of the profess'd Socinians, the Papiſt Brethren, speak very disrespectfully of him; and a known (a) Remonstrant gives this Apostle a very bad Character, telling us that he was a Man of a hot Head, of tumultuary Thoughts, and of broken Style: He is Impertinent and Inconsistent, forgetful of what he had said, Obscure and Indistinct, &c. This is his Language concerning that Apostle, who was deservedly stiled by the Ancients (b) the Pillar of the Churches; (c) the Catholic Preacher; (d) the Trumpet of Heaven; (e) the Publisher of the tremendous Mysteries of Religion; (f) the Interpreter of the Celestial Doctrines. But a Rigid Anti-Calvinist will never forgive this Apostle, and think him worth attending to, merely because he penn'd the 7th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and in other places talks so positively of Predestination.

So the Bishop doth as good as tell us, that there is not much Heed to be given to St. Paul, when he saith we are justified by Faith only; for this is (saith he) no where taught by him, but in a wrangling disputing way, in his Quarrel with the Jews. So that 'tis but a kind of Trial of Skill, and we must not think the Apostle was in good Earnest. Tho' for dispute-sake he keeps up the Doctrine of Justification.

(a) Philip. à Limborch. Commentar. in Acta Apostolorum, &c.

(b) ὁ στήλη τοῦ ἐκκλησιασμοῦ.

(c) ὁ καθολικὸς καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς.

(d) οὐρανίου τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

(e) ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μυστήρια.

(f) Chrysost.

(g) ὁ τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου δογματισμὸς. Ibid. Pelus.

sion by Faith without Works, yet he may be really of another mind, and may be heartily persuaded that we are justified by Works as well as by Faith.

Tho' this Learned Writer is wont sometimes to interfere with himself, (as the most exact do at one time or other) yet why should he imagine the Apostle doth so too? Of this Reverend Person's Self-Contradiction, there is this Instance and Proof. He holds, that the Faith which St. Paul treats of (a) comprehends all the Works of Christian Piety, in which are included all Moral Works; and yet he asserts that when the Apostle saith we are justified by faith without the works of the law, even (b) the Works of Morality, which the Law commends, are excluded. But this by the way only. That which I designedly offer'd to the Reader's Consideration, was this. That this Excellent Writer, whose vast Stock of Reading and Learning can't be sufficiently admir'd, and who is acquainted with all Ancient Authors of the Christian Church, seems to me (pardon the Weakness of my Judgment) to make but ill Use of that Acquaintance; whilst he is rather solicitous to support his own Opinion (tho' very Orthodox) than to represent the Genuine and Plain Sense of those Writers.

To be free; (which is the way to speak and propagate Truth) another Learned Prelate of our own, seems to me (whether really or no, let the Reader judge) to be faulty sometimes in this kind. He makes nothing of Fathers, Councils and Decrees, when they stand in his way; of which there

(a) Harmon. Apostol. Dissertatio prior.

(b) Harm. Apost. Cap. 7.

is a flagrant Instance in his (*a*) *Vindication of Ignatius's Epistles*; where he artfully strives to invalidate the Decree about *Apocryphal Authors*, which pass'd in the Council under *Gelasius the First*, then Bishop of Rome; yea, to perswade us that there was no such Council; to which purpose he peremptorily contradicts a great Number of Authors of good Repute in that Matter. This very Learned Man takes a great deal of Liberty throughout that whole Performance, to deny, or disapprove of what he pleases in Authors, or to evade the Force of what they say, when he dislikes it. His Extraordinary Genius fitted him for it; for he was quick at Repartees, as all his Writings testify; and he is ready sometimes to take up his Adversary, before he is down. He (without doubt) was one of the greatest Divines of the Age, a great Critic in Ecclesiastical Antiquity, and conversant in the Best Authors; and in those Subjects which would bear it, he shew'd himself a very Solid and Judicious Writer, and gave Proof of his deep Insight and Penetration; but in this Undertaking, he seems rather to be plausible, and to flourish rather than to argue, and to come with a form'd Design to run down all that *Daille* said, and thereby to make good what I now offer, That even the most Learned Writers can do what they will with the *Fathers*.

XI. In my next Observation, I will confine myself to the *Canons* and *Councils*, and shew how they likewise (as they are commonly made use of) can yield us but little Satisfaction in any material Points of Divinity. The Editors of them do not agree

(a) *Part I. Chap. 4.*

which of them are True, and which are Forg'd and as to the Interpretation of several Canons, they less agree. *Baronius, Binius, Sirmond, Labbe,* and other great Council-mongers, contradict one another in their Judgment and Censure about the Truth or Forgery of several Synods: And a late Writer, who hath publish'd a *Synopsis of the Canons* differs from them all sometimes, and mingles Genuine and *Suppositions* ones together, so that we can't discern one from the other. And indeed, there is no any Difference between them generally. He pretends to present us with the *Ecclesiastical Canons*, in order to the *Reformation of the Manners of this Age* which seems to be kindly and christianly done of him; but he hath not the Eyes to see that he believeth his own Pretences, and expressly maintains and applauds those Practices which are Condemn'd by those very Canons which he puts forth. (a) One of them enjoyns, that no Clergyman shall take any Secular Cares upon him: otherwise he shall be made incapable of Exercising his Office. (b) Another saith, it is not lawful for a Clergyman to intermeddle in Public Administration, but he must be conversant wholly in Ecclesiastical Employments, for no Man can serve two Masters, according to our Lord's Injunction. And several Councils say the same.

Yet doth this Publisher of them plead for the contrary Practice, and is very highly pleas'd that it doth not prevail with us in England at this day. (c) He wonderfully extols those Times wherein Ecclesiastics were promoted to the highest Secular Employments.

(a) Can. Apost. 81.

(b) Can. Apost. 5.

(c) Laurentii Howel Prolegomena ante Synopsin Canonum, &c.

ments, as the Protectorship of the Realm in the Absence or Minority of the King, the Office of the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, Lord Chief Justice of the Common-Pleas, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Master of the Wards, Lord Chancellor and Lord Treasurer. He, saith he, was the Old Splendor of the Church, the Old Reverence given to the Clergy. And he proceeds to lament the dismal Case of the Church in the following Ages, especially at the Reformation from Popery, because then these blessed Practices were laid aside. And doth it not tend much to the Reformation of Men's Manners to have an Account of the British and Anglo-Saxon Canons, of Legantine and Provincial Constitutions, which fill our Ears with Appeals and Excommunications, Holy Water, Consecrated Oyl, the Seven Sacraments, Mass, Confession, Monks, Nuns, and a hundred Superstitious Rites and Practices? He himself confesses, that many frivolous and impertinent things, and many unlawful and vicious, are the Master of the Clergy, and enjoyn'd by them: yet he and his friends are mightily in love with them. Of which I can give no other Account can be given but this, that they stick after the Superstitions of Rome, and hug any old Manuscripts that bring those to their Thoughts. I might add, that the Canons of one Council usually contradict those of another; and this likewise, that the Annotations on the Canons do frequently pervert the Sense of them: and those Writers who make most use of them, understand them least, or wilfully misinterpret them. As Authentic as the Canons are said to be, yet this Author, when he speaks, omits some part of them: of which I will give a remarkable Instance. In the Council of Au-
gustine, in the Year of our Lord 529, five and twenty Canons were agreed upon about Original Sin, the Natural Depravity of Man's Will, the Necessity of

Super-

Supernatural Grace, &c. but he only acquaints the Reader with the *Title* or *Head* of them, leaving the Explication and Enlargement made by the decrees of that Council; and taken out (for the most part) of *St. Augustine's* Writings, which are the Body and Substance of the Canons. How could this Compiler of the Canons tell the World the Title-page of his Book that this was *Opus ultimum*? You will say, 'tis a *Synopsis*. But I answer, that in one single Council half of the Body of the Canons, and those Parts which are of the greatest moment, he can't excuse this Omission by placing a *Synopsis*, especially when at other times he sets down entirely all the Canons of particular Councils, even when they are about trifling Matters. It is probable then that the true Reason of this Omission was his dislike of those Canons; his Scheme of Distinctly did not agree with the Tenor of some of those Canons. Thus we see that the Determinations of Synods and Councils are rendered useless by one man's other; and they that value them most, drop them when they please; and don't care to produce them, and many of them which they make use of are perplex'd and confounded by them thro' the different, yet contrary Meanings they assign to them. So that instead of Resolving our Doubts, we are brought to one Theological Controversie, hatch'd out of one of these. You will say the Councils (as well as the Fathers Writings) are of use, because we learn from them what *Hereses* and *Errors* were in those times. The Answer to which is; That some of the Persons who presided in those Councils, made what they would to be *Heresies* and *Errors* for those that were *Real Heresies*; if we think fit to look into the matter we shall learn thence what are such without consulting the Councils.

XII. And so I pass to my Last Reflection and Resolution upon the Whole; That seeing the Testimonies and Suffrages of Humane Writers are so precious and arbitrary, and can't be relied upon, the best and wisest Course we can take is to repair to the Fountain-head, that is, to make the Holy Scriptures our Judge. We are to embrace no Doctrines but our Divine Matters that are not built on this Bottom. It is true, the Testimony of the Ancient Fathers of the Christian Church (who we know to be genuine) is not to be despis'd, and no Man of Education, especially no Divine can deserve that Name, unless he be acquainted with these Writers; but the Testimony of the Scriptures is of that nature, that Commands our Assent and Veneration, and all the Authority of the former depends wholly on this latter. If in Sacred and Religious Matters they speak according to the Word, it is because there is no Light, no Truth in them. And this is the Sense of our Mother Church of England, in her 21st Article, General Councils may Err, and sometimes have err'd, even in things pertaining unto God; wherefore things ordain'd by them, necessary unto Salvation, have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scriptures.

The Church of Rome glories in the Consent and Suffrage of the Antient Writers, tho' they have little reason to do so; for, 'tis because they are not able to maintain their Posts by Scripture, that they fly to those to support them. But let our glorying be in that which really deserves it, that is, the Privilege of consulting the Inspired Oracles of God's Word: and let us remember that the repairing to these was the happy Occasion of the Reformation from Popery. When Persons betook themselves to the serious and liberate Reading of the Bible, Ignorance and Error

ror began to vanish, and in a short time there was a New Face of Religion in these Parts of the World. And to this very day the Protestant Churches stand upon this Foot, the Holy Scriptures; a solid and substantial Foot, and such as cannot fail us. Let us then shew our selves True and Sincere Protestants, fixing on this Foundation, and there Resting our selves, not running to Fathers and Synods to support our Religion, much less to Apocryphal and Forg'd Writings, to support our Opinions and Pretensions. The Folly of this was taken notice of and check'd even by one of the Greatest Men of the Roman Communion, who yet was too great an Admirer of Forg'd Antiquity: but the Force of Truth made him break out into such desperate Language as this. *(a) So many Acts and Writings have come forth under the Names of the Apostles, which are found to be Counterfeits, and nothing remains Entire and Uncorrupted that hath been said of them by True Writers; insomuch that we may despair of ever finding what is True and Certain.* And this Forging of the Names of Authors, and the Writings, continued in the Church for many Ages, as all Ecclesiastical Historians that shew any Impartiality confess.

Now then let us understand our selves aright, and be sensible where we may have Sure-Footing, that is, in the Genuine Doctrines of the Apostles and Evangelists, which are convey'd to us in their infallible Writings. Not that I deny that there are some very good things in all or most of those other Books, yea sometimes very choice Remarks, and useful Passages, and excellent Rules of Life, which account they are worth our perusing; but they are not serviceable to that End for which

(a) Baron. Annal. ad Annum Christi 41.

Primitive Christianity Reviv'd. 61

Whifm and some others alledge them; because their Authority is justly question'd, and they are of that Antiquity which is boasted, they are corrupted and maim'd, and in many Places they have the Air of a Cheat. Who then cannot but wonder at this Upstart *Arian's* strong and impudent attempt to perswade us out of our Catholic and apostolic Faith, by quoting a few Bastard Authors, and some Novice Writers, who had no Understanding of the Great Mysteries of Christianity, or express'd them in such obscure and ambiguous Terms, 'tis hard to know what they meant? But let us build on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, which is plain and obvious to every sincere Mind.

Seeing we are bless'd with the Bible, let us make use of it, and observe how plainly and expressly it speaks concerning those Articles of Christianity which are now the subject of our Discourse. All that the *Nicene Fathers* and other Orthodox Writers have said of the *Trinity*, was first deliver'd in the Scriptures, therefore let us fetch it thence. The sum of what those Antients profess'd, was this; That the Son was begotten of the Father, and therefore was of the same Substance with him; That this Ineffable Generation of the Son was before all Worlds, that is, from Eternity; and consequently the Son was Coeternal with the Father, as well as Consubstantial; That there are in the Deity Three Persons, really distinct from one another; That these Three Persons are One God; That Divine Worship are to be paid unto them.

This is the *Nicene Plan* of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and there is plain Scripture for all this; as John 1. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* His being with God expresses

62 Reflections on Mr. Whiston's

expresses his Eternal Subistence with his Father, whom he was begotten from Eternity. In Chapter, v. 14. he is asserted to be the only begotten of the Father; and ch. v. 16. he is only begotten Son, which necessarily implies a Generation and Filial peculiar to him, and coeval with the Divine Father. In 1. Heb. 3. he is affirm'd to be the brightness of his Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Person, his Substance, yea of his Essential and Real Nature. 2. Phil. 2. Being in the form of God, i. e. having the Essential Nature of God; He thought it not robbery to be equal with God. 10. John 10. I and my Father are one. 14. John 10. I am in the Father, and the Father in me. 1. John 5. 7. These Three are One, united in one Nature or Essence. 5. John 14. All men honour the Son, even as they honour the Father: he that honoureth not the Son even as he honoureth the Father, honoureth not the Father. This is what the First Ministers of God's Word have taught us in the Writings of the New Testament: and therefore it was rightly said by Bellarmine himself, (a) When the Nicene Council determin'd that Christ was of the same Substance with the Father, they deduced this Conclusion from Scriptures. From these pure Fountains we draw our Faith: and so far as any Councils or Fathers agree with these, we are to listen to them, but not otherwise.

Let me shew this in another Scheme of Divine Doctrine, to let the Reader see yet further, that we are not so much concern'd to know and assert what Humane Writers have determin'd, as what the Inspired ones have deliver'd and taught us in the Holy Scriptures. Those that hold the Five Points

(a) De Concil. lib. 2. cap. 12.

Articles of Religion in another way than the Roman and Arminians do, offer several Testimonies out of the Writings of the Fathers, as St. Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, Optatus, Milertinus, of Scyth, &c. And out of the Councils, as the Milan A. D. 415, the 14th Carthaginian, A. D. the Milevitan under Innocent the III^d, that of the time of Theodorus the Younger, to their Assertion concerning the Eternal Deity, the Immutability of Man's Will, Grace and Conscience, the Redemption purchased by Christ, Perseverance, &c. with the Doctrines of Original Sin and Justification. They have enough in some of the Testimonies of the Church, to oppose to and counterbalance whatever can be alledg'd out of those writings against them, but they have not enough to support their Judgments; and therefore, tho' they cite those Authors, yet they lay no great stress on their Testimonies for the Reasons before-given: but tell their Adversaries that they have a more sure Foundation depend upon; and they urge, that the Calvinistic Doctrines, above-recited, are all of them founded on these express Texts of Scripture, which fol-

low: *He hath predestinated us according to the good pleasure of his will, Eph. 1. 5. According to his good pleasure which he purposed in himself, 9. 7. He worketh all Things according to the pleasure of his own will, 11. 4. As many as were ordained to Eternal Life, believed, 13. Acts 13. The Father of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord hath them that are his, 2. Tim. 2. 19. It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure, Phil. 2. 13. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discern'd, 1. Cor. 2. The Carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is*
not

64 Reflections on Mr. Whiston's

not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can
 Rom. 7. I know that in me, that is, in my flesh
 no good thing, 7. Rom. 18. It is not of him that
 nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth
 9 Rom. 16. By grace are ye saved, thro' faith, not
 of your selves, it is the gift of God, 2 Eph. 1.
 Man cometh into me except the Father draw him,

We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus
 works, which God hath before ordained that we should
 in them, 2 Eph. 10. Even so Father, for so it is
 good in thy sight, 11. Mat. 26. I pray not for them
 but for them which thou hast given me, 17 John
 shall be given to them for whom it is prepar'd of my
 20. Mat. 23. The gifts and calling of God are with-
 out penitence, 11 Rom. 29. None shall take them out
 hand, 10 John 28, 29. We were by nature the child-
 ren of wrath, even as others, 2 Eph. 3. By one man sin
 into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed
 upon, for that all have sinned, 5. Rom. 13. It
 is justified by faith without the works of the law,
 Rom. 18. Not of works lest any man should
 Eph. 9.

Here's the Calvinian Scheme, and if we en-
 sure of the genuine Meaning of these plain
 it will be difficult to tell how we can be secure
 Meaning of any other Parts of Scripture, or of
 Reveal'd Religion. If there was a Thousand
 others, and as many Councils, that should deliver
 thing contrary to this, we ought to slight and
 their Testimony: yea, if we could suppose (as
 Apostle did) that an Angel from Heaven
 preach any other Doctrine, we must give no
 to him; for the Scripture is our Rule, and we
 receive no Doctrine appertaining to the Christian
 Faith but what is regulated by this. *Arbuthnot*
 a warm and courageous Defender of the Faith ag-

Arians. Augustine was a valiant and zealous Advocate of it against the Pelagians: the one vigorously maintained the Doctrine of the Trinity; the other the Sovereignty of God, and the Weakness of Man; both were renowned for this, that they guided their Sentiments by the Holy Scriptures, which are the Standard of all our Apprehensions concerning these Matters.

The contrary Conduct renders Mr. Whiston infamous among all Wise and Good Men. I tremble to repeat his Words in his *Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions*, Chap. 2. P. 162, 163. If it be said, saith he, that *ancient Books of the New Testament are the Sacred Rule of Faith and Practice for the Church*, I must reply that this is *very false in Fact*. And afterwards, *we strangely mistake the nature and design of these Sacred Writings*, if we esteem them as the proper Rule of Faith and Practice of Christians. And this is agreeable to what he asserted at other times, that the Copies of the Bible are faulty; that the Canon of Scripture is lame and imperfect: and he is the Man that undertakes to render it compleat and entire, by adding the Books of *Constitutions* to it, which he tells us are the *Perfect Rule of Faith and Manners*. But according to him the New Testament can't pretend any such thing, because, there the Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity, and especially of the Divinity of Christ is so plainly set forth and established. That is enough to disprove this Book for ever.

But the Christian Reader needs not to have the contrary perswasion urg'd upon him: his owning the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, to be the Sole Unerring Canon, will be to him a Sovereign Remedy against the Poison, which Mr. Whiston hath endeavour'd to spread abroad in his late Writings. I despair not of seeing a Good Issue of his Ill Attempts,

Attempts, according to that Observation of the
 Father of the Christian Church, who lets us
 (a) that God suffers Heretics to disturb and
 the Doctrines belonging to the Catholic
 that thereby "Those Doctrines may be con-
 more diligently, and understood more
 and preach'd more warmly. Thus the Ad-
 ries, calling in question these Truths give
 sion to the Orthodox to instruct Men
 These Doctrines, and to convince them of
 reality of them. And another great Doctor of
 Church, speaking of the benefit that accrues by
 resies, tells us, that (b) they do no Harm
 that are settled on the Foundation of the Right
 but render them more Firm and Strong. And I hope
 by the Over-ruling Providence and Management
 Heaven, the Event of all those Wild and En-
 gant Notions, which have of late pester'd the Ch-
 will be this, namely, that we shall prize and
 the Holy Scriptures more than ever we have
 before; and that after all our wandering, we shall
 last be brought to an Unity, not only in Doctr-
 but in Devotion, Affection, and Practice. The
 Errors and Heresies shall prove advantageous to
 great Ends of Religion; and the restless Oppo-
 of the Divine Truth, shall come at last to be all

(a) Multa quippe ad fidem Catholicam pernitentia, he-
 reticorum callida inquietudine agitantur, ut adversus eos
 possint, & considerantur diligentius, & intelliguntur clari-
 instantius prædicantur: & ab adversario mora questio
 existit occasio. Augustin. de Civ. Dei. Lib. 16. c. 2.

(b) Ταῖς ἑρесьμας πονηρίας ἐν τῷ Συναγῆτι τῆς
 ἐκκλησίας ἀποκαθάρσις γίνεται, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς
 αἰῶσι. Chrysost. Hom. 54. Tom. 5.

their busy Attempts to impose upon the Christian World, and to make use of the Names and Authority of the Antients to debauch our Religion. To conclude, let us hope and pray, that a Person, whom I had bless'd with such considerable Parts, and requir'd Excellencies, may at last be sensible of his error, and be as eminent in asserting and vindicating the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as he hath been in corrupting and depraving it.

F I N I S.

which only Attempts to impose upon the Chri-
stian World, and to make use of the Names and Au-
thority of the Apostles to delude our Religion. To
include, for as hope and joy, that a Person, whom
it had blest with such considerable Parts, and
such Excellencies, may at last be sensible of his
sin and be as eminent in asserting and vindicating
the Doctrine of the Trinity, as he hath been in cor-
rupting and separating it.

F I N I S

PROPOSALS

For Printing by **SUBSCRIPTION,**

THEOLOGIA REFORMATA:

O R, THE

Body or Substance of the Christian Religion,

Comprised in

Distinct Discourses or Treatises upon,

THE APOSTLES CREED, commonly so called: Where all the *Principles*, and *Articles* of the Christian Faith therein contain'd, are particularly explain'd, asserted, and vindicated. Especially, under the First Article, The **BEING, ATTRIBUTES** and **PROVIDENCE** of **GOD**, are copiously handled, and the Truth of them demonstrated from several New and Uncommon Topicks; With Particular Answers to the Arguments and Objections brought against them. To the Article of the *Holy Catholick Church*, are reduced the *Officers* of the Christian Church with their *Peculiar Employments*; the *Sacraments*, and all the other *Sacred Institutions* belonging to the *Worship* of **GOD**, and to the *Discipline & Government* of the **CHURCH**.

II. THE

II. THE LORD'S-PRAYER : Where

the full *Sense* of every *Petition* is assign'd, and the *Matter* of our *Prayers* discours'd of. With a *General Treatise* of the *Nature, Kinds, Qualifications, Necessity and Excellency* of *Prayer*. Where the *Meaning* of *Praying by the Spirit* is examin'd and decid'd. The *Nature* of *Temptation* (under the last *Petition*) is amply set forth : The whole *State* of a *Wounded Conscience* is consider'd ; All the *Scruples* and *Complaints* of *Tempted Souls*, are fully answer'd, and *Proper Remedies* are applied.

III. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS :

Where the *Rules* and *Measures* of our *Religious Practice* are largely discours'd of : With a more particular *Account* of the *Love* of *God*, and of our *Neighbour* ; of *Idolatry*, or *Polytheism* ; of *Obedience* to the *Higher Powers* ; of the *Observation* of the *Lord's-Day* ; of *Marriage* and *Divorce* ; of *Usury* ; of the *Abuse* of the *Tongue* ; of *Covetousness* ; of *Contentment*.

In this *Undertaking*, several *Theological Problems* and *Controversies* are discuss'd ; *Sundry Cases* of *Conscience* stated and resolv'd ; *Obscure Passages* in *Scripture* clear'd ; The *Author's Particular Judgment* concerning some of them propounded ; *Practical Inferences* from the *Respective Doctrines* every where interspersed.

The Whole adjusted to the *Infallible Standard* of the *Holy Scriptures*, and the *Judgment* of the *Protestant Reformed Churches* ; and design'd as an *Antidote* in this *Corrupted Age*, against the *Dangerous Notions* and *Opinions* of *Papists, Arians* and *Sacramentarians, Pelagians*.

*Religionists, and Remonstrants, Deists, Atheists, Socinians,
Enthusiasts, Libertines.*

All is endeavour'd to be so framed, as not to be
below the Genius of the Learned, nor above the
Capacity of others.

By **JOHN EDWARDS, D. D.**

PROPOSALS.

THIS Book will contain about 400 Sheets,
which will make Two Volumes in *Folio*;
and shall be Printed on a Good Paper, and on the
same Letter with these Proposals.

II. The Price to Subscribers will be One Pound
and Sixteen Shillings in Quires. Ten Shillings on-
ly of which to be paid down, and One Pound and
Six Shillings more at the Delivery of the Book.

III. They who procure Subscriptions for Six
Books, shall have a Seventh *gratis*; which will reduce
the Price to about Thirty One Shillings in Quires.

The Book is ready for the Press; and as soon as
sufficient Number of Subscribers are procured, it
will go forward, and be finished with all convenient
Expedition.

The

The UNDERTAKERS

JOHN LAWRENCE, at the

JOHN WYAT, at the

Yard And

RANER ROBINSON, at the
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*;

Who deliver out **PROPOSALS**, and
SUBSCRIPTIONS.

PROPOSALS

The Gentlemen who will be pleased to
this Work, are desired by the *Anchor*,
Undertakers, to send in their First Payment
at least with an Assurance under their Names
Numbers they will Subscribe for of the
mentioned Books, by the First Day of
that so the Impression may be proportioned
the Number of the Subscribers.

which to be paid down, and One Pound and
things more at the Delivery of the Book.

They who procure Subscriptions for Six
shall have a Seventh given; which will reduce
three to about Thirty One Shillings in Quires.

Book is ready for the Press, and as soon as
Number of Subscribers are procured, it
forward, and be finished with all convenient